7274

Final Data Usability Summary and Resampling Proposal for Fort Sheridan

March 22, 1996

Prepared for: Fort Sheridan, Fort Sheridan, Illinois

By: U.S. Army Environmental Center
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, 21010

Distribution unlimited,
approved for public release

Phase I Data Usability evaluation Report
Fort Sheridan

-AQ #U98-12-2413

☐ 0 copies are being forwarded. Indicate whether Statement A, B, C, D, E, F, or X applies.

In our collection we have a different title "Final Data Usability Summary + Resampling Proposal" March 22, 1996. It is sent instead of the above title. It is unlimited distribution

☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE: DISTRIBUTION IS UNLIMITED

☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT B:
DISTRIBUTION AUTHORIZED TO U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ONLY; (Indicate Reason and Date). OTHER REQUESTS FOR THIS DOCUMENT SHALL BE REFERRED TO (Indicate Controlling DoD Office).

☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT C:
DISTRIBUTION AUTHORIZED TO U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND THEIR CONTRACTORS; (Indicate Reason and Date). OTHER REQUESTS FOR THIS DOCUMENT SHALL BE REFERRED TO (Indicate Controlling DoD Office).

☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT D:
DISTRIBUTION AUTHORIZED TO DoD AND U.S. DoD CONTRACTORS ONLY; (Indicate Reason and Date). OTHER REQUESTS SHALL BE REFERRED TO (Indicate Controlling DoD Office).

☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT E:
DISTRIBUTION AUTHORIZED TO DoD COMPONENTS ONLY; (Indicate Reason and Date). OTHER REQUESTS SHALL BE REFERRED TO (Indicate Controlling DoD Office).

☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT F:
FURTHER DISSEMINATION ONLY AS DIRECTED BY (Indicate Controlling DoD Office and Date) or HIGHER DoD AUTHORITY.

☐ DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT X:
DISTRIBUTION AUTHORIZED TO U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS OR ENTERPRISES ELIGIBLE TO OBTAIN EXPORT-CONTROLLED TECHNICAL DATA IN ACCORDANCE WITH DoD DIRECTIVE 5230.25, WITHHOLDING OF UNCLASSIFIED TECHNICAL DATA FROM PUBLIC DISCLOSURE, 6 Nov 1984 (Indicate date of determination). CONTROLLING DoD OFFICE IS (Indicate Controlling DoD Office).

☐ This document was previously forwarded to DTIC on _____ (date) and the AD number is _____.

☐ In accordance with provisions of DoD instructions, the document requested is not supplied because:

☐ It will be published at a later date. (Enter approximate date, if known).

☐ Other. (Give Reason)

DoD Directive 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents," 18 Mar 87, contains seven distribution statements, as described briefly above. Technical Documents must be assigned distribution statements.

Julia K. Tracy
Print or Type Name

J. K. Tracy
Authorized Signature/Date

410-679-7878
Telephone Number

Final Data Usability Summary and Resampling Proposal for Fort Sheridan

March 22, 1996

Fort Sheridan performed validation of data which had been collected during the Remedial Investigation (RI) in 1990-1991. As required by the Ft. Sheridan Overall Quality Assurance Project Plan (OQAPP), this validation was performed in accordance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Contract Laboratory Program National Functional Guidelines (NFG). The validation results were presented in a draft data validation report, which was reviewed by the EPA and Illinois EPA. Comments on the draft report are being addressed in a final version of the report expected to be completed in early 1996. Sufficient information exists in the draft report, and the regulatory comments, to now determine the extent of resampling that should provide assurance that the 1990-1991 dataset may be used with confidence in the future versions of the RI report. This plan describes the resampling to be performed. The basic approach discussed here was determined in discussions between Fort Sheridan, the EPA, Illinois EPA, the Army Environmental Center, and its RI consultant, Environmental Science and Engineering, Inc.

The data validation process resulted in qualifiers being assigned to the samples as shown in Table 1. The data received two general types of qualifiers that are discussed in this plan: R (meaning "rejected") and J (meaning "estimated"). The two qualifiers require two types of resampling to assure the 1990-1991 dataset is acceptable. Resampling of most of the R-flagged data will be conducted to replace the original data (except as discussed later in this plan). The J-flagged data will not be replaced, but at least 10% of the J-flagged samples will be retaken/reanalyzed and compared with the original results to provide an indication of overall data quality.

The draft data validation report presented the data in groupings of analytical lots, as compared to the grouping by sample number or sampling site in this plan. An analytical lot is the collection of samples that are analyzed by one analytical method in one day. Under the QA Program used for the 1990-1991 data, certain laboratory spikes and blanks are used to perform method control for each lot. All the laboratory documentation for samples is grouped by the lots, into data packages. These packages were used to perform the data validation, and the results were grouped in the data validation report by lots. Since the validation itself is not dependent on the location of a particular sample, or the usefulness of that sample in the RI, this lot grouping is acceptable for the validation report. However, when using the validation results to select which samples must have appropriate quality for the RI, a site-by-site grouping is necessary, and thus such a grouping is used in this plan.

The validation results have been placed into a database that includes the lots, the sample numbers, and the qualifiers assigned to each

analyte in each method. The complete database will be a part of the final validation report. Although the lot names shown in the validation report do not appear in the tables in this plan, the qualifiers assigned for every sample, which are shown in this plan, are taken from the database.

One U.S. EPA comment on the draft validation report, from their November 16, 1995 letter to Fort Sheridan, asked whether rejected data in certain lots should be retaken. Since this comment contains a resampling concern, rather than a validation concern, it is addressed in the site-by-site discussion below, but the lots are not mentioned. However, near the end of this plan, just prior to the conclusions section, the comment is discussed more fully to show that it was addressed.

R-Flagged Data

In Table 1 the various types of qualifiers are tallied for each sample. The individual qualifiers are assigned to the individual analytes in each sample. For instance, one sample may have 15 analytical results for the various metals analyzed for in a typical method. The entire method could have a deficiency, such as lack of calibration checks, that could flag each of the analytes with an "R". Possibly the method itself was acceptable, but one analyte, like chromium, may have had a deficiency that caused it to receive an "R" flag. Some samples have many R flags, some have only 1 or 2, and many have none. Some analytes are responsible for the majority of the "R" flags, possibly due to a difficulty with that analyte in the method. It is not uncommon for organics methods especially to have difficulty consistently meeting the NFG specified limits for several analytes. These analytes may or may not be significant (or chemicals of concern) at Fort Sheridan, depending on whether they were detected in many samples or not. These issues were considered in the selection of resampling criteria.

The R-flagged data will be replaced unless (1) only 1 or 2 of the sample's analytes were flagged, and (2) such flagging was due to analytes that are typically difficult to quantify (and hence no analytical improvement during the resampling is likely), and (3) these analytes are not likely to be chemicals of concern at Fort Sheridan. The samples from Table 1 with at least 1 R-flagged analyte were considered for replacement. Table 2 shows these samples. The table indicates whether the sample will be rejected from any further use during the RI, and whether the sample will be replaced. For samples with only 1 or 2 rejected analytes the table shows the analytes responsible for the R-flagging, in order to be able to determine if they are typical "problem" analytes. Samples with 3 or more rejected analytes do not list the affected analytes in the table since these samples will be replaced regardless of what the affected analytes are. The reason for such a cutoff at 2 "R" flags is that 115 out of the 144 samples in Table 2 have 1 or 2 R-flagged analytes. Nearly all of these R-flags are due to a small set of analytes that are typically difficult to quantify within the NFG limits. Hence, little or no improvement in data quality may be possible if resampling/reanalysis is performed.

Also, if these analytes with the R-flags are not likely to be chemicals of concern at Ft. Sheridan, then retaking 115 samples solely to obtain NFG compliance with this small set of analytes is not beneficial to the Fort Sheridan RI and is not cost effective.

Table 2 shows that Methyl Ethyl Ketone (MEK) is the main problem analyte, responsible for flagging 102 of the samples. A check of all the Ft. Sheridan samples (i.e., soils, sediments, surface water, and groundwater) showed that there were no detections of MEK in any sample, implying that MEK is not a likely contaminant of concern at Fort Sheridan. Hence, no sample was rejected because of MEK rejection. The samples with rejected MEK will stay in the RI, though the results for the MEK will not be used. However, since MEK is not a likely concern, the loss of the MEK data should pose no problem. The other "problem" analytes from Table 2 are 2,4-dinitrophenol, 4,6-dinitro-2-cresol, methyl isobutyl ketone, cyanide, 4-nitroaniline, 2-chloroethylvinyl ether, benzoic acid, PCB 1016, and PCB 1260. As with the MEK, the entire Ft. Sheridan database was checked for detections of these analytes, and the results are shown in Table 3. Of these analytes, only cyanide and PCB 1260 were detected, and thus might be contaminants of concern. Any samples rejected due to these analytes may have to be replaced since valid data may be needed for these possible contaminants of concern. The only data that was affected by a questionable cyanide analysis was two (i.e., DW01 and DW02) of five existing drilling water samples, both of which were analyzed the same day (November 8, 1990). Since these drilling water results are not used to define contamination in the RI, but only to verify that the water source is appropriate for use, these samples would not be part of the dataset used in the risk assessment. Thus, rejection will not matter for these samples; they are not used in further RI calculations.

The detection of PCB 1260, at VES2 (see Table 3), shows that it does exist onsite and could be a contaminant of concern. Hence, the one sample that is affected by a rejection for PCB (i.e., in Table 2, Janes Ravine, site C-0130) will be resampled, to assure that valid results for PCB 1260 are obtained for this location.

This then addresses the samples in Table 2 with 1 or 2 rejected analytes. The remaining samples in Table 2 with more than 2 rejected analytes, with the exception of the SEWER site type samples, will each be retaken and analyzed for the same contaminants as was done in 1990-1991.

The SEWER samples were taken from the Ft. Sheridan storm sewer system, and the results were listed in the draft final RI report. However, the storm sewer data is not expected to be used in the next versions of the RI to determine risk. The storm sewers are not expected to be excavated, and to cause exposure, during future use of Ft. Sheridan, the material in the sewers is not considered a release, and the actual release points at the outfalls have been investigated and the data from these outfalls will be used to determine risk. Thus, resampling of the sewer interior locations with rejected data is not considered necessary since a complete dataset from the 1990-1991 sampling locations will not be needed or used in the RI.

Note from Table 2 that every groundwater sample will be retaken. Since groundwater conditions are often changing at a site, and since the last groundwater data at Fort Sheridan was taken in 1991, at least two additional sampling rounds at all the wells are planned during the RI in order to obtain current information. Even without the 1990-1991 dataset, these two rounds of data should be sufficient for the RI. Hence, no site-specific resampling of groundwater is planned since essentially 100% resampling is being conducted.

J-Flagged Data

Based on Illinois EPA comments on the data validation report, the inorganics data (i.e., graphite furnace spectroscopy and Inductively Coupled Argon Plasma Spectroscopy) and pesticides/PCBs/herbicides data (i.e., Gas Chromatograph/Electron Capture (GC/EC) methods) data will be considered as J-flagged, and screening level, data until confirmed by a minimum of 10% resampling and analysis conducted according to the data quality protocols described in the project OQAPP. A comparison of the original and the corresponding new data will then be made to determine if the entire set of original 1990-1991 results may be used in the RI and the risk assessment.

Such a comparison will be complicated. Because of the variation inherent in performing current analytical methods, a difference of up to 20-50% between the original and new data could be found and not be indicative of analytical problems in 1990-1991. Another major source of variation will be the samples themselves. Surface water and sediment sites will not be resampled (other than to replace rejected samples as discussed above) since the water and sediment sampled in 1990-1991 has likely changed in composition, preventing a reasonable comparison between the original and new results. The soil samples offer the best chance of an effective comparison. Probably the soil contaminant levels have not changed significantly since 1990-1991, especially in the subsurface and especially for the inorganics that are the focus of this resampling. However, soils often show a significant variation in composition between even fairly close sampling points. To try to minimize this, the soil samples will be retaken as near to the original soil sample sites as possible. Variation will be impossible to avoid, however, since the surface soil sampling locations were not required to be surveyed in 1990-1991, but rather were estimated by tape from the nearest surveyed location. A difference of 5-10 feet from the original location is likely to occur. The soil boring locations generally were surveyed since monitor wells were intended to be installed in most of them. However, since it is necessary to avoid disturbing the wells, the resampling of the soil boring locations will have to be conducted 10-20 feet away from the original boring locations. In the cases where test pit samples will be retaken, a soil boring will be used instead of a test pit. The reasons for this are (1) that the boring will be less intrusive than the test pit, (2) the visual waste characterization advantages of a test pit will not be needed, only the samples themselves, and (3) the test pit would provide no better sample site duplication since the exact location of the original sample within the

pit was not recorded. Whether a soil boring or test pit is used to retake a test pit sample, there will still be a likely 2-10 foot separation between the 1990 samples and the 1996 samples. Since the exact sampling points cannot be exactly duplicated, some variation in analytical results will likely be indicative of sample composition differences rather than potential analytical problems in 1990-1991.

The number of non-groundwater samples taken during the RI, as shown in Table 1, is approximately 404. Not all of these are appropriate for resampling as discussed below:

a. The RI included 47 soil samples at the Underground Fuel Storage Tank sites (i.e., buildings 115, 125,and 208). Since petroleum releases are excluded from regulation under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), these sites are being addressed under the underground fuel storage tank closure provisions of the State and Federal laws, and will not be included in the future submissions of the revised RI. Additional soil data is being, or has been, obtained to document the tank closures; the existing RI data is not being used either in those closures or in the future RI. Hence, resampling of these sites will not be conducted.

b. The RI included sampling of some of the buildings, shown in the soils database (i.e., media type CSO in Table 1) as 14 wipe samples. Listed under building interior samples (i.e., media type CBI in Table 1) are also 6 concrete cores and 3 wood cores of the floors of some buildings. These areas are not being included in the future versions of the RI since they are not considered by the Army an environmental release under CERCLA. The condition of building interiors in the Surplus Operable Unit is being documented by the Army separately from the RI.

c. The RI included 16 samples of surface soils in various ditches and outfalls, and 25 samples in the sewer system. Since these locations likely continued to receive some flow after 1990-1991, the soils are likely to have changed in composition. Hence, resampling of ditches and outfalls to verify the original results would not indicate variation in laboratory effectiveness, but rather variation in the samples. As noted above in the discussion of the rejected SEWER samples, the sewer samples will not be used to determine risk in the RI, and hence the sewer sample dataset will not be resampled to help verify the quality of J-flagged data.

The data mentioned in a, b, and c above will not be a part of the resampling. Deleting these samples from the 404 total leaves 296 samples needing a 10% resampling effort to effectively check the validity of the original analytical methods. At least 30 samples then must be retaken to satisfy this requirement. These samples will be 100% validated before being used for comparison with the original 1990-1991 results. Since a completely valid resample effort is needed, roughly a 15% resampling (i.e., 44 samples) will actually be planned in order to assure that field sampling or laboratory problems do not reduce the valid data percentage below 10%.

Since not all of the RI samples were analyzed by all of the methods (i.e, inorganics, PCBs by GC/EC, pesticides/herbicides by GC/EC, and herbicides by GC/EC), the actual basis for the resampling percentage may be different than 296 samples. This is discussed in the summary below.

A mixture of considerations were used in selecting the samples, including:

-to assure that major sites of concern to the BRAC process (i.e., each of the landfills) would be sampled,

-to sample sites with the highest known risks from the RI,

-to sample some sites with low levels of contaminants,

-to sample sites with the highest concentrations of the contaminants which cause the majority of the risks, and

-to sample a variety of soil depths.

Note also that reanalysis for PAHs is also planned at many of the sites. For some sites, there was no particular advantage to be gained for the analyses in question by picking certain sample locations. Any of them would be acceptable. However, PAHs were risk "drivers" at several sites, and it would be beneficial to resample these locations using the new PAH method described in the OQAPP. Hence, at several sites, the presence of comparatively high PAH levels was the criteria for picking resampling locations.

The samples which were selected are shown in Table 4 and are discussed individually below. The samples are discussed by RI site in the order the sites appeared in the RI. Note that Table 4 lists a resample number, R#, assigned to allow convenient counting of samples. It also lists which of the analyses were performed, and which must be performed again. To support the discussion below, Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 are attached to show the soil sample detections of thallium, pesticides/herbicides, PCBs, and PAHs, respectively. Thallium and PAHs are noted as risk "drivers" in the RI report. Thallium, pesticides/herbicides, and PCBs are currently screening level data based on the draft data validation report and Illinois EPA comments. These tables are sorted alphabetically by the site ID, which generally coincides with the first letter(s) of the site name. Table 9 is included to show by site the hazard quotients and carcinogenic risks calculated in the draft final RI report, and the percentages of J-flagged analytes in the various samples at each site.
Samples that had a large percentage of their analytes J-flagged were more likely to be selected for resampling.

Landfill 1

The only samples considered for resampling were from the 4 and 14 foot depths of boring 3S, which had comparatively high lead, zinc, and PAH values. However, both of these depths were logged during the RI as fill

material (i.e., ash, cinders, brick). This is consistent with the location of the boring in the middle of a filled former ravine. Such material would be expected to be very nonhomogeneous. A well was completed in this boring and to prevent disturbance of this well any resampling would be conducted 10-20 feet away from the original sample. The likely high variability in the material, and distance between the samples, would prevent our obtaining another sample with nearly the same composition as the original. Hence, a reasonable comparison of laboratory methods alone could likely not be done, and resampling is not proposed. No other samples at this site exhibited unusual metals results, and pesticides/herbicides/PCBs were not sampled/analyzed for at this site. No resampling is proposed at landfill 1.

Landfill 2

This site was listed in the draft final RI report as having a risk of 1.2x10(-5) for future use, primarily due to PAHs. Twenty six samples were listed in the draft final RI. The metals results were reasonably uniform and low, and pesticides/herbicides/PCBs were not analyzed for. One of the proposed resamples, at LF2SB03, serves only to confirm low levels of metals at the surface. The remaining five resamples also accomplish this, but they were selected to allow the Army to check comparatively high (i.e., 0.3-10 ppm) PAH concentrations, which account for the majority of the risks for this site.

Landfill 3

This site was noted in the draft final RI as having a risk concern from thallium, DDT, and RDX. Pesticides or explosives analyses were not conducted at this site, and the risks were evidently due to "lumping" with another site. Inorganics analyses were performed and thallium was detected at moderate levels at sample locations LF3SB01 and LF3SB04D (see Table 5). Note that separate site IDs for landfills 3 and 4 were not used in the RI, apparently since the landfills border each other. LF3 was used as the site ID for both the landfill 4 and landfill 3 samples. Of the 5 sample locations labelled as LF3* in the draft final RI (see Table 1), two were sited at Landfill 3 (i.e., SB04D and SB05) and three were sited at Landfill 4 (i.e., SB01, SB02, and SB03). The two locations at landfill 3 produced a total of six samples, which are all proposed for resampling. All six samples had generally low concentrations of inorganics, except for the detected thallium in SB04D. All these results will be confirmed by retaking all six samples. The results at landfill 3 are not unusual compared to most of the other RI sites; these six samples were selected mainly to assure that Landfill 3 was represented in the resampling.

Landfill 4

The risk information noted above for landfill 3 applies also to landfill 4, since the two sites were lumped in the draft final RI.
The four samples noted for resampling in Table 4 were selected due to the large percentages of J-flagged data in the samples (see Table 1), to confirm the presence of thallium, to obtain a variety of depths for resampling, and because one sample (near the surface) had comparatively

high PAHs (i.e., sample see Table 8). While not a concern at this site, or a data validation concern, PAHs are risk drivers at other sites and some additional confirmation for these analytes may be useful. The low inorganics results for these samples, and the moderate levels of thallium, will all be confirmed.

Landfill 5

The draft final RI noted thallium as a risk driver for Landfill 5. Of the 11 samples that were taken, three samples were selected for resampling due to the large percentage of J-flags (i.e., in excess of 50% of the analytes were flagged J as shown in Table 1). Also, PAHs were detected in these samples (see Table 8) and the thallium concentration was comparatively high (see Table 5).

Landfill 6

The three samples from boring number 3 were selected for resampling since this was the only soil boring, out of four at this landfill, where thallium was detected. Thallium is a risk driver for this site. Zinc and chromium were also higher in this boring than in the other three. The other two RI-listed risk drivers, RDX and DDT, were not sampled for at this site, and were apparently noted due to lumping with another site.

Landfill 7

Soil boring three with its three samples was selected for resampling since it was the only boring where thallium was detected at Landfill 7. Thallium is a risk driver for this site. The selected samples will also allow confirmation of low chromium results; chromium is another RI-listed risk driver.

Coal Storage Area 1

The draft final RI listed a fairly low risk for this site, but test pit 1 at this site was selected since one of its two samples had the highest value of thallium (254 ppm) measured onsite in the soils. Thallium is the RI-listed risk driver for this site.

Coal Storage Area 2

No samples were selected from this site. This site was shown to have relatively low risk in the draft final RI (see Table 9). One of the listed risk drivers, zinc, did not have particularly unusual results at CSA2. Zinc results from other sites will provide the same comparison information. Of the remaining two listed risk drivers, RDX and DDT, neither was sampled for at this site and "lumping" apparently caused them to be listed as concerns. Also, RDX, an explosive, is not a validation concern.

Coal Storage Area 3

This site was listed in the RI as having one of the higher risks (e.g., exceeding 1x10(-4) carcinogenic risk for future use, see Table 9), due to PAHs, thallium, and zinc. Thallium and comparatively high values of PAHs (i.e., over 10 ppm) were detected in the one sample at test pit 1 selected for resampling. The second of the two test pits at this site did not have appreciably different zinc concentrations from test pit 1. Either test pit provides the inorganics comparison data needed; test pit 1 has the advantage of allowing verification of the high PAH levels.

Coal Storage Area 4

This site had the highest future carcinogenic risk listed in the draft final RI, with risk and hazard drivers listed as PAHs, thallium, and zinc. Four samples were taken in the RI, and all 4 are proposed for resampling. Thallium and PAHs were detected in all the samples selected. Test pit 2 in particular had the highest PAH concentrations (see Table 8) of all the Ft. Sheridan soil samples.

Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 1

This is a low risk site (based on the draft final RI), and the analytical methods requiring verification were not conducted during the 1990-1991 RI. Only GC/MS volatile organic compounds and BNAs analyses were originally planned and conducted at the VES sites. None of the RI-listed risk "drivers", zinc, RDX, or DDT, were analyzed for in the RI. They were apparently listed as risk "drivers" due to lumping with other sites. Hence, no comparison of methods is needed, and no samples were selected for resampling.

Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 2

Although the explanation for VES 1 applies, one sample was selected for resampling. This sample had the only detection of PCBs seen in the soils during the RI. However, this result came from the GC/MS BNA analysis, rather than the GC/EC PCB analysis which is being verified as part of this effort. The GC/EC method for PCBs had not been planned for this site since PCBs were not expected. It is useful to confirm this result with another sample using the current PCB method approved in the OQAPP.

Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 5

Same as VES 1, except the only listed risk "drivers" were chloride and sulfate, neither of which involves an analytical method requiring verification.

Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 6

Same as VES 1, except the only listed risk "drivers" were chloride and sulfate, neither of which requires verification.

Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 7

Same as VES 1.

Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 9

Same as VES 1, except that the draft final RI listed very low risk and highlighted no risk drivers.

As discussed above, the following 3 locations are no longer part of the RI:

Building 115 Underground Storage Tank

Building 125 Underground Storage Tank

Building 208 Underground Storage Tanks

Bldgs 137X, 137, and 139 Storage Areas

This is a low risk site, and no risk drivers were listed in the draft final RI. One test pit (number 4) at B137 had consistent detections of several PAHs, but the levels were comparatively low, and the PAH method does not require verification. GC/EC methods were not used here and hence no comparison is needed. Inorganics were analyzed for, however, verification resampling at other sites provides an adequate number of samples for verification. No resampling is planned.

Building 122 Storage Area

This site had minimal risk (based on the RI) and the only listed risk "driver" was PAHs. However, many of the RI's GC/EC pesticide/herbicide/PCB analyses were conducted at this site and thus provide the opportunity for verification comparison. Four samples will be retaken. One, at soil boring 1, will help confirm the accuracy of one of the 3 existing pesticides detections in a soil boring (see Table 6). Most of the pesticides detections (22 of them) were in the watercourses, manholes, and outfalls, where changed conditions over the last 4 years make a valid comparison of only laboratory procedures unlikely or impossible. The second sample selected, at soil boring 8, will help confirm some comparatively high (e.g., >= 10 ppm) PAH detections while also confirming nondetect of pesticides/herbicides/PCBs. The third and fourth samples at borings 12 and 13 will confirm nondetects of pesticides/herbicides/PCBs.

Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 126

The draft final RI listed minimal risk, and no risk "drivers", for this site. However, again many of the RI's GC/EC pesticide/herbicide/PCB analyses were conducted at this site and thus provide the opportunity for verification comparison. Also, many of the analyses for organochlorine herbicides (i.e., 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T by GC/EC)) were conducted at this site and require verification. There were no detections of these herbicides, but the nondetections will be verified.

Three samples from one boring (i.e., SB01) are planned at this site. The surface sample will verify one of the 3 pesticide detections found in Ft. Sheridan soil borings. The other two samples from this boring will verify comparatively low metals results, and nondetects in all the GC/EC methods.

Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 128

A low risk site with no unusual contamination. None of the analyses requiring verification were conducted here in the draft final RI, hence, no resampling is needed or planned.

Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 216

Test pit B216TP1 provided data in the draft final RI for metals in samples taken 4 and 7 feet deep, however the data was not found in the Army Environmental Center's Installation Restoration Data Management Information System database and was not validated in the recent NFG validation. Hence, these 2 samples will be rejected and retaken. These 2 samples are shown in the upper section of table 4 with other samples that will replace 1990-1991 data.

Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 368

Listed as moderate risk site (e.g., risk >1x10(-5) for future use), but contamination is not comparatively high. None of the analyses requiring verification were conducted here in the draft final RI, hence, no resampling is needed or planned.

Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 377

Listed as moderate risk site (e.g., 3.3x10(-5) for future use)in the RI due to chromium, but measured levels of this and other contaminants is not comparatively high. Risk may be due to "lumping" with other similar yard areas with higher contamination. Adequate "re-samples" for the metals and GC/EC methods are selected from other sites; no resampling is planned at building 377.

Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 902

Listed in the draft final RI as a low risk site with no unusual contamination. None of the analyses requiring verification were conducted here in the draft final RI, hence, no resampling is needed or planned.

Building 43

The only RI sample was in a manhole, which was cleaned out in 1995 as part of a time-critical removal action. Hence there is no opportunity to obtain a comparison sample; no resampling is planned.

Building 70

The only samples at this site were of the wood floor inside the building. See discussion above regarding building interiors.

Building 122

Wipe samples were taken of the interior of this building. See discussion above regarding building interiors.

Building 137

Wipe samples were taken of the interior of this building. See discussion above regarding building interiors.

Building 139

Cores were taken of the concrete floor and wipe samples were taken in this building. See discussion above regarding building interiors.

Building 142

Wipe samples were taken of the interior of this building. See discussion above regarding building interiors.

Building 361

Wipe samples were taken of the interior of this building. See discussion above regarding building interiors. A sediment sample was taken in a manhole. Changing conditions invalidate this location for comparison use.

Missile Fueling Point

A low risk site, based on the draft final RI. The three samples selected for resampling were chosen to provide some low inorganics levels for comparison. Thallium and RDX are listed in the RI as the risk "drivers". The thallium data will be verified by the resampling. RDX was not detected at this site, and apparently was listed due to lumping with another site. The RDX does not require verification as the explosives method is not in question.

NIKE Missile Silos

Original samples were taken in the silos or were of the water which filled the silos. The water and sediments in the silos are likely to have changed in composition and would provide less effective comparison samples than soil samples from other locations on Ft. Sheridan. No resampling is planned here.

The following nine locations had water and sediment samples taken in the RI. As discussed above, due to changing conditions from continued water flow, they would not provide effective, consistent samples with which to measure laboratory procedures.

Janes Ravine

Airport Drain

Hutchinson Ravine

Scott Loop Drain

Bartlet Ravine

Officer Family Housing Drain

Van Horne Ravine

Landfill 7 Black Pipe

Shenck Ravine

EPA Comments

EPA provided the following comment on the draft validation report:

"The following lots have "R" qualifiers. Are any of these analytes contaminants of concern at their respective sites? If so, a resampling or further investigation should occur.

Lot	Analysis Type	Media	#Samples
UBQ	VOA GC/MS	Water	3
UQJ	VOA GC/MS	Soil	7
UPK	BNA GC/MS	Soil	7
ULP	BNA GC/MS	Water	1
VDV	BNA GC/MS	Soil	10
UCE	Spectrophoto-metric	Water	2"

Response:

A check of the IRDMIS database at USAEC shows that lot UBQ actually contains one sample, sample number TSHDW1*2 (see Table 2), which is a drilling water sample. The listing of three samples in the draft validation report is an error which will be corrected. As noted above in the discussion of rejected samples, this sample was rejected because of cyanide, and cyanide may be a contaminant of concern at Fort Sheridan. However, since this drilling water sample does not itself characterize the Ft. Sheridan site, and will not be used in the risk assessment, the sample will not be retaken.

The listing of lot UQJ appears to be a typo in the comment; lot UQJ does not exist. Rather, lot VQJ has the stated 7 VOA samples in the soil media. The samples are:

FTSHS6*4

FTSHS6*5
FTSHS6*6
FTSHS6*7
TSHS6*11
TSHS6*13
TSHS6*14

These samples each contain rejected analytes and are each being retaken (see table 4).

The listing of lot UPK appears to be a typo in the comment; there is no lot UPK. Rather, lot UDK does exist and contains the 7 stated soil BNA samples. The samples are:

FTSHS2*1
TSHS1*28
TSHS1*29
TSHS1*30
TSHS1*31
TSHS1*32
TSHS1*33

Only the first sample had any rejected analytes (see tables 1 and 2), but this sample was from the chemical separator at building 43, which has been removed, and no resampling is possible.

Lot ULP contains the one sample TSHDW1*5, which is a drilling water sample. The analytes causing rejection were MEK and 4-nitro aniline, which are not likely contaminants of concern at Fort Sheridan since they were not detected. Since this is a drilling water sample, it will not be repeated.

Lot VDV contains the following samples:

TSHS5*13 Sewer Manhole 4590
TSHS5*15 Sewer LF7LCS
TSHS5*19 R SEWER Manhole 4100
TSHS5*21 Bartlett Ravine Outfall C-3290
TSHS5*25 SEWER Manhole 5810
TSHS5*28 R SEWER Wells Ravine AI10-36
TSHS5*30 R Basin SB-LF7
TSHS5*31 Hutchinson Ravine Outfall C-0692
TSHS5*36 Shenck ravine outfall OD-3
TSHS5*37 R SEWER manhole 3870

An "R" is listed after the sample number if the sample contained rejected analytes. Three of these rejected samples are from the sewer system and will not be retaken since this system is not within the RI (see discussion above). The basin at landfill 7 will be resampled as shown in Table 4.

Lot UCE contains TSHDW1*1, and TSHDW1*2, which are both drilling water samples and will not be retaken.

Summary

Of the approximately 500 samples in the 1990-1991 Remedial Investigation, 144 were found to have at least one analytical result that was rejected. Of these 144 samples, only 12 were found to require replacement to assure a complete dataset for the RI. Of the remaining 132 samples, each have only one or two analytes for which the results are not usable, and the other analytes in the samples can be used in the RI. The loss of the unusable results is not expected to negatively affect the RI as discussed in the sections above. Besides the 12 samples to be retaken, 2 other samples from the RI were not properly documented and validated, and will also be retaken. A total of 14 samples will be retaken to replace invalid data.

The samples from 1990-1991 were analyzed for inorganics and pesticides/herbicides and PCBs. These results are considered as screening type data under the NFG, mainly due to differences between the methods used in 1990-1991 and the current NFG requirements. To elevate these data to a quality level such that they can be used in the risk assessment, a minimum of 10% resampling is needed. The new results (obtained using OQAPP methods) will then be compared with the original results to determine if they differ significantly due to possible previous laboratory problems.

In the RI soil samples, there were approximately 243 inorganics analyses, 43 pesticide/herbicide analyses, 24 herbicide analyses, and 43 PCB analyses. The selected samples in Table 4 which will be retaken total 43 inorganics analyses, 8 pesticide/herbicide, 4 herbicide, and 8 PCB. (Note that the two samples from VES2 for PCBs are not counted in the total of 8 listed here; the above discussion for this site explains that the new results will assist the RI, but will not be used for analytical method verification.) The percentages of resampling are then 18%, 18%, 17%, and 19%.

Selected resampling locations are only discussed here for the soils. All groundwater samples are being retaken to determine the current groundwater conditions, since groundwater is normally changing and the last samples were taken 5 years ago. Since complete groundwater resampling is being performed, selecting certain groundwater samples for resampling is not done in this plan.

TABLE 1: Remedial Investigation Samples with Data Qualifiers
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal

Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Sample Depth (feet)	Number of Analytes	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below							
								None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J
CSO	OTFL	AIRPORT	C-0300	TSHS5*32	01-May-91	0	178	149		11	8		1	9	15.73%
CSW	OTFL	AIRPORT	C-0300	TSHW5*27	01-May-91	0	182	123	1	9	6	1		42	31.32%
CGW	WELL	B115	B115MW01	FTSHW1*1	15-Apr-91	19.8	159	119		6	1	1		32	24.53%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB01	FTSHS1*2	15-Nov-90	14	177	139		11	19		1	7	20.90%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB01	FTSHS1*3	15-Nov-90	24	177	138		12	19		1	7	21.47%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB01	FTSHS1*1	14-Nov-90	4	168	139		11	10		1	7	16.67%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB02	FTSHS1*4	15-Nov-90	2	162	136		14	4		1	7	15.43%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB02	FTSHS1*5	15-Nov-90	8	176	138		12	18		1	7	21.02%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB02	FTSHS1*6	16-Nov-90	24	177	139		11	19		1	7	20.90%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB03	FTSHS1*9	26-Nov-90	24	177	135		9	19		1	13	23.16%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB03	FTSHS1*8	26-Nov-90	12	178	133		11	20		1	13	24.72%
CSO	BORE	B115	B115SB03	FTSHS1*7	26-Nov-90	2	163	132		14	5			12	19.02%
CGW	WELL	B122	B122MW01	FTSHW6*1	23-Jul-91	12	188	144		9	2	1		32	22.87%
CGW	WELL	B122	B122MW02	TSHW6*22	23-Jul-91	11.5	190	143		9	4	1		33	24.21%
CSO	WIPE	B122	122F1WP1	FTSHS2*6	15-Nov-90	0	124	84			6	2		32	30.65%
CSO	WIPE	B122	122F1WP2	FTSHS2*7	15-Nov-90	0	118	84				2		32	27.12%
CSO	WIPE	B122	B122BLK	FTSHS2*8	15-Nov-90	0	119	84			1	2		32	27.73%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB01	TSHS1*37	28-Jan-91	0	186	98		15			1	72	46.77%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB02	TSHS1*38	29-Jan-91	3	186	133		13				40	28.49%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB03	TSHS1*58	28-Jan-91	2.5	186	133		12				41	28.49%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB04	TSHS1*59	29-Jan-91	1	208	133		15	22			38	36.06%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB05	TSHS1*60	29-Jan-91	2	192	112		13	6		1	60	41.15%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB06	TSHS1*61	29-Jan-91	3	193	133		12	7			41	31.09%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB07	TSHS1*62	29-Jan-91	3	187	111		14	1		1	60	40.11%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB08	TSHS1*63	29-Jan-91	3	199	133		13	13		1	39	32.66%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB09	FTSHS6*1	11-Jul-91	4	188	147		15	2		1	23	21.28%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB09	FTSHS6*2	11-Jul-91	9	187	138		11	1		1	36	25.67%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*4	10-Jul-91	1	187	100		15	1	35		36	27.81%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*6	10-Jul-91	9	187	113		13	1	35	1	24	20.32%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*5	10-Jul-91	4	191	109		14	5	35		28	24.61%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB11	FTSHS6*7	10-Jul-91	4	186	99		14		35	1	37	27.42%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB12	TSHS6*11	10-Jul-91	9	188	99		15	2	35	1	36	28.19%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB12	TSHS6*10	10-Jul-91	4	187	148		15	1			23	20.86%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB13	TSHS6*15	10-Jul-91	9	187	134		14	1		1	37	27.81%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB13	TSHS6*13	10-Jul-91	1	187	94		7	1	44	4	37	24.06%
CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB13	TSHS6*14	10-Jul-91	4	187	100		13	1	35	1	37	27.27%
CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW01	FTSHW1*6	08-Feb-91	26.1	159	150		2	1	1		5	5.03%
CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW01	FTSHW1*4	12-Dec-90	9	161	131		9	3	12		6	11.18%
CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW01	FTSHW1*4	12-Dec-90	5.7	161	131		9	3	12		6	11.18%
CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW02	FTSHW1*5	11-Jan-91	5.7	164	149		5	6	4			6.71%
CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW04	B125MW04	14-Nov-91	10									#DIV/0!
CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW04	TSHW6*24	14-Nov-91	10	158	140		7		2		9	10.13%
CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW05	B125MW05	15-Nov-91	11									#DIV/0!
CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW05	TSHW6*25	15-Nov-91	11	160	143		5	2	2		8	9.38%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB01	TSHS1*12	09-Nov-90	14	178	142		11	20		1	4	19.66%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB01	TSHS1*11	09-Nov-90	6	159	142		11	1		1	4	10.06%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB01	TSHS1*10	08-Nov-90	0	159	139		14	1		1	4	11.95%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB01	TSHS1*57	12-Nov-90	7	162	141		10	4		1	6	12.35%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB02	TSHS1*14	13-Nov-90	10	169	141		10	11		1	6	15.98%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB02	TSHS1*13	13-Nov-90	2	159	141		10	1		2	5	10.06%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB03	TSHS1*18	14-Nov-90	7	168	141		10	10		1	6	15.48%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB03	TSHS1*17	14-Nov-90	5	167	140		12	9		1	5	15.57%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB03	TSHS1*16	14-Nov-90	3	179	140		12	21			6	21.79%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB04	TSHS6*33	27-Jul-91	2	159	137		15	1			6	13.84%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB04	TSHS6*34	27-Jul-91	4	158	138		15				5	12.66%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB04	TSHS6*35	27-Jul-91	6	158	138		15				5	12.66%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB05	TSHS6*36	27-Jul-91	2	158	138		15				5	12.66%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB05	TSHS6*37	27-Jul-91	4	158	138		15				5	12.66%
CSO	BORE	B125	B125SB05	TSHS6*38	27-Jul-91	6	159	139		13	1			6	12.58%
CGW	WELL	B126	B126MW01	TSHW1*13	02-Apr-91	22.3	53	18		9				26	66.04%
CSO	BORE	B126	B126SB01	TSHS1*41	13-Dec-90	24	53	13		14				26	75.47%
CSO	BORE	B126	B126SB01	TSHS1*40	13-Dec-90	8	53	13		15				25	75.47%
CSO	BORE	B126	B126SB01	TSHS1*39	13-Dec-90	0	53	11		16				26	79.25%
CSO	PIT	B126	B126TP1	TSHS4*74	20-Mar-91	7	24	10		13			1		54.17%
CSO	PIT	B126	B126TP1	TSHS4*66	19-Mar-91	7	53	16		12			1	24	67.92%
CSO	PIT	B126	B126TP1	TSHS4*73	20-Mar-91	4	24	10		13			1		54.17%
CSO	PIT	B126	B126TP1	TSHS4*65	19-Mar-91	2.5	53	15		13			1	24	69.81%
CSO	PIT	B126	B126TP2	TSHS4*67	18-Mar-91	2.5	53	14		16			1	22	71.70%
CSO	PIT	B126	B126TP2	TSHS4*68	18-Mar-91	7	53	16		12			1	24	67.92%
CSO	PIT	B128	B128TP1	TSHS4*69	21-Mar-91	3	139	129			4			6	7.19%
CSO	PIT	B128	B128TP1	TSHS4*70	21-Mar-91	6.8	142	129			7			6	9.15%
CSO	PIT	B128	B128TP2	TSHS4*71	20-Mar-91	2.5	135	128						7	5.19%
CSO	PIT	B128	B128TP2	TSHS4*72	20-Mar-91	6.8	140	128			5			7	8.57%
CBI	CONC	B137	137F1CN1	TSHS2*14	15-Nov-90	0	23	11		10			2		43.48%
CBI	CONC	B137	137F1CN2	TSHS2*15	15-Nov-90	0	23	8		14			1		60.87%
CBI	CONC	B137	137F1CN3	TSHS2*16	15-Nov-90	0	23	11		11			1		47.83%
CSO	WIPE	B137	137F1WP1	FTSHS2*9	14-Nov-90	0	120	98		4		2	6	10	11.67%
CSO	WIPE	B137	137F1WP2	TSHS2*10	14-Nov-90	0	137	95		5	18	2	7	10	24.09%
CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP1	TSHS4*57	21-Mar-91	2.5	159	140		14			1	4	11.32%
CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP1	TSHS4*58	21-Mar-91	7.2	167	139		15	8			5	16.77%
CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP2	TSHS4*59	25-Mar-91	3	161	135		15	2	1		8	15.53%
CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP2	TSHS4*60	25-Mar-91	6.7	160	134		13	1	1	1	10	15.00%
CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP3	TSHS4*62	22-Mar-91	6.7	159	140		13			1	5	11.32%
CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP3	TSHS4*61	22-Mar-91	3.5	159	140		10			1	8	11.32%
CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP4	TSHS4*63	21-Mar-91	2.5	160	137		14	1		1	7	13.75%
CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP4	TSHS4*64	21-Mar-91	4.3	179	136		11	20		5	7	21.23%

TABLE 1: Remedial Investigation Samples with Data Qualifiers
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal

Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Sample Depth (feet)	Number of Analytes	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below							
								None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J
CBI	CONC	B139	139F1CN1	TSHS2*17	15-Nov-90	0	23	11		9			3		39.13%
CBI	CONC	B139	139F1CN2	TSHS2*18	15-Nov-90	0	23	12		9			2		39.13%
CBI	CONC	B139	139F1CN3	TSHS2*19	15-Nov-90	0	23	12		9			2		39.13%
CSO	WIPE	B139	139F1WP1	TSHS2*11	14-Nov-90	0	132	96		5	13	2	6	10	21.21%
CSO	WIPE	B139	139F1WP2	TSHS2*12	14-Nov-90	0	124	97		4	5	2	6	10	15.32%
CSO	WIPE	B139	B139BLK	TSHS2*13	14-Nov-90	0	133	99		3	14	2	5	10	20.30%
CSO	WIPE	B142	142F1WP1	TSHS2*20	15-Nov-90	0	27							27	100.00%
CSO	WIPE	B142	142F1WP2	TSHS2*21	15-Nov-90	0	27							27	100.00%
CSO	WIPE	B142	B142BLK	TSHS2*22	15-Nov-90	0	27							27	100.00%
CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW01	FTSHW1*7	02-Apr-91	5.6	183	133		13	25	1		11	26.78%
CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW02	FTSHW1*8	11-Jan-91	8.9	162	149		5	4	4			5.56%
CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW03	FTSHW1*9	11-Feb-91	22.4	160	151		1	2	1		5	5.00%
CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW04	TSHW1*10	11-Feb-91	14.9	162	145		4	4	1		8	9.88%
CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW05	FTSHW6*2	24-Jul-91	23.3	160	148		7	2	1		2	6.88%
CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW06	FTSHW6*3	29-Jul-91	23	159	144		7	1	1		6	8.81%
CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW07	FTSHW6*4	24-Jul-91	23.3	158	149		6		1		2	5.06%
CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW08	TSHW6*23	29-Jul-91	23	158	143		8		1		6	8.86%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB01	TSHS1*19	27-Nov-90	2	179	131		13	21		1	13	26.26%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB01	TSHS1*20	28-Nov-90	6	169	132		13	11			13	21.89%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB01	TSHS1*21	28-Nov-90	8	166	133		12	8		1	12	19.28%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB02	TSHS1*22	28-Nov-90	4	159	129		14	1			15	18.87%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB02	TSHS1*23	28-Nov-90	10	171	129		13	13			16	24.56%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB03	TSHS1*26	30-Nov-90	10	164	138		13	6			7	15.85%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB03	TSHS1*27	30-Nov-90	24	158	138		12				8	12.66%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB03	TSHS1*25	30-Nov-90	4	185	139		14	27			5	24.86%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB04	TSHS1*28	11-Dec-90	4	179	134		13	21			11	25.14%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB04	TSHS1*30	11-Dec-90	14	158	134		12				12	15.19%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB04	TSHS1*29	11-Dec-90	10	158	135		13				10	14.56%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB05	TSHS6*16	14-Jul-91	4	159	141		12	1			5	11.32%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB05	TSHS6*18	14-Jul-91	14	159	135	1	11	1			11	14.47%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB05	TSHS6*17	14-Jul-91	9	159	141		12	1			5	11.32%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB06	TSHS6*20	13-Jul-91	4	164	141		12	6			5	14.02%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB06	TSHS6*21	13-Jul-91	19	159	141		12	1			5	11.32%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB06	TSHS6*19	13-Jul-91	1	159	141		12	1			5	11.32%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB07	TSHS6*24	13-Jul-91	14	159	141		12	1			5	11.32%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB07	TSHS6*22	13-Jul-91	1	161	141		12	3			5	12.42%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB07	TSHS6*23	13-Jul-91	9	165	141		12	7			5	14.55%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB08	TSHS6*12	15-Jul-91	14	159	141		12	1			5	11.32%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB08	FTSHS6*8	15-Jul-91	1.5	160	139		17	2			2	13.13%
CSO	BORE	B208	B208SB08	FTSHS6*9	15-Jul-91	9	160	141		12	2			5	11.88%
CSO	PIT	B216	B216TP1			4						All			
CSO	PIT	B216	B216TP1			7						All			
CSE	MAHO	B361	361E5SEW	TSHS2*26	14-Nov-90	3	123	99		16	4		1	3	18.70%
CSO	WIPE	B361	361F1WP1	TSHS2*23	14-Nov-90	0	159	138		3		2	6	10	8.18%
CSO	WIPE	B361	361F1WP2	TSHS2*24	14-Nov-90	0	158	136		4		2	6	10	8.86%
CSO	WIPE	B361	361F1WP3	TSHS2*25	14-Nov-90	0	158	137		3		2	6	10	8.23%
CGW	WELL	B368	B368MW02	TSHW1*15	22-Mar-91	8	135	131				1		3	2.22%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB01	TSHS1*44	09-Jan-91	33	140	126		1	5			8	10.00%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB01	TSHS1*42	08-Jan-91	0	151	120		3	16			12	20.53%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB01	TSHS1*43	08-Jan-91	16	156	120			21			15	23.08%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB02	TSHS1*45	10-Jan-91	0	190	163		2	15			10	14.21%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB02	TSHS1*46	10-Jan-91	8	175	162		1	1			11	7.43%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB02	TSHS1*47	10-Jan-91	12	156	121		1	21			13	22.44%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB03	TSHS1*49	11-Jan-91	6	184	162			10			12	11.96%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB03	TSHS1*50	12-Jan-91	14	157	121		1	22			13	22.93%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB03	TSHS1*48	11-Jan-91	2	174	162						12	6.90%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB04	TSHS6*25	12-Jul-91	4	136	121			1			14	11.03%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB05	TSHS6*27	12-Jul-91	4	136	134			1			1	1.47%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB06	TSHS6*30	12-Jul-91	9	136	122			1			13	10.29%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB06	TSHS6*29	12-Jul-91	4	157	121			22			14	22.93%
CSO	BORE	B368	B368SB06	TSHS6*28	12-Jul-91	1	136	121			1			14	11.03%
CSO	PIT	B368	B368TP1	TSHS4*75	09-Mar-91	2.6	139	123		2	4			10	11.51%
CSO	PIT	B368	B368TP1	TSHS4*76	09-Mar-91	4	156	123			21			12	21.15%
CSO	PIT	B368	B368TP2	TSHS4*77	09-Mar-91	3	135	133						2	1.48%
CSO	PIT	B368	B368TP2	TSHS4*78	09-Mar-91	2.5	137	132		1	2			2	3.65%
CSO	BORE	B377	B377SB01	TSHS1*52	21-Jan-91	10	171	95		15	22			39	44.44%
CSO	BORE	B377	B377SB01	TSHS1*53	21-Jan-91	24	171	95		14	22			40	44.44%
CSO	BORE	B377	B377SB01	TSHS1*51	21-Jan-91	1	149	94		16				39	36.91%
CSO	PIT	B377	B377TP1	TSHS4*80	19-Feb-91	7	155	104		13	6			32	32.90%
CSO	PIT	B377	B377TP1	TSHS4*79	19-Feb-91	1.3	149	104		14				31	30.20%
CSO	PIT	B377	B377TP2	TSHS4*81	19-Feb-91	25	149	104		13				32	30.20%
CSO	PIT	B377	B377TP2	TSHS4*82	19-Feb-91	7	149	104		13				32	30.20%
CSO	PIT	B377	B377TP3	TSHS4*84	25-Feb-91	8	153	109		12	4			28	28.76%
CSO	PIT	B377	B377TP3	TSHS4*83	25-Feb-91	2.5	149	109		14				26	26.85%
CSR	MAHO	B43	B43CS1	FTSHS2*1	13-Dec-90	5	185	41		32	28	60		24	45.41%
CSR	MAHO	B43	B43CS1	FTSHW2*1	12-Dec-90	5	158	94		4	24	1		35	39.87%
CBI	WOOD	B70	70F1WD1	FTSHS2*3	15-Nov-90	0	137	93		2	19			23	32.12%
CBI	WOOD	B70	70F1WD2	FTSHS2*4	15-Nov-90	0	136	93		3	18			22	31.62%
CBI	WOOD	B70	70F1WD3	FTSHS2*5	15-Nov-90	0	132	93		3	14			22	29.55%
CSO	PIT	B902	B902TP1	TSHS4*86	10-Mar-91	2.5	135	133						2	1.48%
CSO	PIT	B902	B902TP1	TSHS4*85	10-Mar-91	3	145	1332		1	10			2	8.97%
CSO	PIT	B902	B902TP2	TSHS4*87	10-Mar-91	2	155	33			20			2	14.19%
CSO	PIT	B902	B902TP2	TSHS4*88	10-Mar-91	7	135	133						2	1.48%
CSO	PIT	B902	B902TP3	TSHS4*94	11-Mar-91	4.5	154	125			19			10	18.83%
CSO	PIT	B902	B902TP3	TSHS4*93	11-Mar-91	3	136	132		1	1			2	2.94%
CSO	DTCH	BARTLETT	C-2370	FTSHS5*7	01-May-91	0	177	132		12	18			15	25.42%

TABLE 1: Remedial Investigation Samples with Data Qualifiers															
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal															
						Sample	Number	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below							
Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Depth (feet)	of Analytes	None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J
CSO	OTFL	BARTLETT	C-3290	TSHS5*21	15-May-91	0	190	147		9	2		4	28	20.53%
CSW	DTCH	BARTLETT	C-2370	FTSHW5*7	01-May-91	0	181	146	2	10	14	1		8	17.68%
CSW	OTFL	BARTLETT	C-3290	TSHW5*16	15-May-91	0	197	153	1	12	1	1		29	21.32%
CSO	BORE	CSA1	CSA1SB01	TSHS1*32	12-Dec-90	12	120	99		12				9	17.50%
CSO	BORE	CSA1	CSA1SB01	TSHS1*33	13-Dec-90	24	120	101		14				5	15.83%
CSO	BORE	CSA1	CSA1SB01	TSHS1*31	12-Dec-90	2	128	100		15	8			5	21.88%
CSO	PIT	CSA1	CSA1TP1	FTSHS4*2	07-Feb-91	3.8	120	88		16				16	26.67%
CSO	PIT	CSA1	CSA1TP1	FTSHS4*1	07-Feb-91	2.1	139	90		14	19			16	35.25%
CSO	PIT	CSA1	CSA1TP2	FTSHS4*3	07-Feb-91	1.6	120	88		16				16	26.67%
CSO	PIT	CSA1	CSA1TP2	FTSHS4*4	07-Feb-91	7	120	90		15				15	25.00%
CSO	PIT	CSA2	CSA2TP1	FTSHS4*5	09-Feb-91	2.7	122	102		14	2			4	16.39%
CSO	PIT	CSA2	CSA2TP1	FTSHS4*6	09-Feb-91	7	121	103		13	1			4	14.88%
CSO	PIT	CSA2	CSA2TP2	FTSHS4*8	11-Feb-91	8	121	103		13	1			4	14.88%
CSO	PIT	CSA2	CSA2TP2	FTSHS4*7	11-Feb-91	5	120	101		15				4	15.83%
CSO	PIT	CSA3	CSA3TP1	FTSHS4*9	08-Feb-91	2	142	90		15	22			15	36.62%
CSO	PIT	CSA3	CSA3TP2	TSHS4*11	08-Feb-91	2.7	122	87		17	2			16	28.69%
CSO	PIT	CSA3	CSA3TP2	TSHS4*12	08-Feb-91	7	122	90		16	1			14	25.41%
CSO	PIT	CSA4	CSA4TP1	TSHS4*16	05-Feb-91	7.5	131	40		14	11			66	69.47%
CSO	PIT	CSA4	CSA4TP1	TSHS4*15	05-Feb-91	1.5	127	39		22	7			59	69.29%
CSO	PIT	CSA4	CSA4TP2	TSHS4*18	04-Feb-91	7.3	122	64		17	2			39	47.54%
CSO	PIT	CSA4	CSA4TP2	TSHS4*17	04-Feb-91	0.8	127	99		15	7			6	22.05%
CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW01	TSHDW1*1	08-Nov-90	-3	198	166		2	2	2		26	15.15%
CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW02	TSHDW1*2	08-Nov-90	-3	200	124		9	4	1		62	37.50%
CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW03	TSHDW1*3	13-Dec-90	-3	200	146		2	3	12		37	21.00%
CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW04	TSHDW1*4	13-Dec-90	3	199	160		3	2	1		33	19.10%
CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW04	TSHDW1*4	13-Dec-90	-3	199	160		3	2	1		33	19.10%
CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW05	TSHDW1*5	28-Jan-91	-4	198	149		8	1	2		38	23.74%
CSO	DTCH	HUTCHIN	C-0690	TSHS5*33	01-May-91	0	170	154		5			3	8	7.65%
CSO	OTFL	HUTCHIN	C-0692	TSHS5*31	15-May-91	0	176	152		6	6		4	8	11.36%
CSO	DTCH	HUTCHIN	C-0732	FTSHS5*6	02-May-91	0	170	141		12	12			5	17.06%
CSW	DTCH	HUTCHIN	C-0690	TSHW5*28	01-May-91	0	176	122		12		1		41	30.11%
CSW	OTFL	HUTCHIN	C-0692	TSHW5*26	15-May-91	0	176	158		10		1		7	9.66%
CSW	DTCH	HUTCHIN	C-0732	FTSHW5*6	02-May-91	0	168	148	1	10	1	1		7	10.71%
CSO	DTCH	JANES	C-0031	FTSHS5*2	30-Apr-91	0	210	148		10	22		1	29	29.05%
CSO	DTCH	JANES	C-0130	FTSHS5*1	30-Apr-91	0	196	146		18	9	2	1	20	23.98%
CSO	DTCH	JANES	C-0242	FTSHS5*3	18-May-91	0	198	116		10	10	15	4	43	31.82%
CSO	OTFL	JANES	OD-1	FTSHS5*4	01-May-91	0	200	150		12	12		2	24	24.00%
CSW	DTCH	JANES	C-0031	FTSHW5*2	30-Apr-91	0	196	153	1	10		1		31	20.92%
CSW	DTCH	JANES	C-0130	FTSHW5*1	30-Apr-91	0	196	153		12		1		30	21.43%
CSW	DTCH	JANES	C-0242	FTSHW5*3	18-May-91	0	208	147		11	12	1		37	28.85%
CSW	OTFL	JANES	OD-1	FTSHW5*4	01-May-91	0	196	119	1	9		1		66	38.27%
CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW01	TSHW6*11	15-Jul-91	39	167	149		8		1		9	10.18%
CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW01	TSHW3*45	26-Mar-91	33	168	142		7	1	1		17	14.88%
CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW02	FTSHW3*9	22-Mar-91	33	170	152		7	3	1		7	10.00%
CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW03	FTSHW3*2	12-Feb-91	50	166	152		4		1		9	7.83%
CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW03S	FTSHW3*1	26-Feb-91	14	185	137		5	19	16		8	17.30%
CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW04	TSHW3*10	23-Mar-91	19.6	169	152		7	2	1		7	9.47%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB01	FTSHS3*7	14-Jan-91	0	160	121		16	1			22	24.38%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB01	FTSHS3*9	14-Jan-91	39	181	129		14	22			16	28.73%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB01	FTSHS3*8	14-Jan-91	9	180	130		13	21			16	27.78%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB02	TSHS3*10	21-Jan-91	0	161	142		13	2			4	11.80%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB02	TSHS3*11	21-Jan-91	14	181	142		13	22			4	21.55%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB02	TSHS3*12	21-Jan-91	29	181	141		13	22			5	22.10%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB03D	FTSHS3*5	08-Jan-91	41	199	118		14	1			66	40.70%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB03D	FTSHS3*6	09-Jan-91	51	222	141		13	24			44	36.49%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB03D	FTSHS3*4	08-Jan-91	26	209	175		14	11			9	16.27%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB03S	FTSHS3*1	01-Dec-90	4	159	103		17				39	35.22%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB03S	FTSHS3*2	01-Dec-90	14	159	105		18				36	33.96%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB03S	FTSHS3*3	01-Dec-90	23	159	108		17				34	32.08%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB04	TSHS3*13	11-Jan-91	0	198	174		14				10	12.12%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB04	TSHS3*14	11-Jan-91	14	222	175		12	23			12	21.17%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB04	TSHS3*15	11-Jan-91	24	220	141		13	22			44	35.91%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB05	TSHS3*17	12-Jan-91	14	181	135		13	22			11	25.41%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB05	TSHS3*16	12-Jan-91	0	161	135		14	2			10	16.15%
CSO	BORE	LF1	LF1SB05	TSHS3*18	12-Jan-91	24	181	135		14	22			10	25.41%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW01	TSHW6*12	16-Jul-91	42	180	156		9	4	1		10	12.78%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW01	TSHW3*11	17-Apr-91	39	177	102		10	1	1		63	41.81%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW02	TSHW6*13	13-Jul-91	26	171	147		11	4	1		8	13.45%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW02	TSHW3*12	04-Apr-91	16.2	180	156		9	4	1		10	12.78%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW04	TSHW3*15	15-Apr-91	26.6	176	103		9		1		63	40.91%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW04S	TSHW3*14	07-Mar-91	7.1	179	92	1	3	3	2		78	46.93%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW05	TSHW3*17	15-Apr-91	28	177	105		6	1	1		64	40.11%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW05S	TSHW3*16	25-Mar-91	9.4	176	153		7		1		15	12.50%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW06	TSHW6*21	29-Aug-91	21.5	176	167		8			1		4.55%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW06	TSHW3*19	18-Apr-91	22	176	152		8		1		15	13.07%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW06	TSHW6*21	29-Aug-91	0	176	167		8			1		4.55%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW06S	TSHW6*20	07-Aug-91	8.5	178	151	1	10	2	1		13	14.04%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW06S	TSHW3*18	25-Mar-91	7	176	153		7		1		15	12.50%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW07	TSHW3*21	05-Apr-91	31.9	196	157		10	20	1		8	19.39%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW07S	TSHW3*20	07-Mar-91	4.3	177	104	1	3	1	2		66	39.55%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW08	FTSHW6*8	09-Aug-91	29	176	141		10		2		23	18.75%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW08S	FTSHW6*7	06-Aug-91	7.1	177	152		10	1	1		13	13.56%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW09	TSHW6*10	28-Aug-91	28	176	161		9			1	5	7.95%
CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW09S	FTSHW6*9	06-Aug-91	7.3	176	153		9		1		13	12.50%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB01	TSHS3*20	25-Jan-91	24	192	152		14	22			4	20.83%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB01	TSHS3*19	24-Jan-91	0	170	151		15				4	11.18%

TABLE 1: Remedial Investigation Samples with Data Qualifiers
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal

Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Sample Depth (feet)	Number of Analytes	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below							
								None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB02	TSHS3*24	13-Jan-91	22	189	147		8	19		1	14	21.69%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB02	TSHS3*22	13-Jan-91	0	174	145		15	4			10	16.67%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB02	TSHS3*23	13-Jan-91	10	192	146		11	22			13	23.96%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB03	TSHS3*25	07-Mar-91	0	170	144		14				12	15.29%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB03	TSHS3*26	07-Mar-91	19	178	148		7	8		3	12	15.17%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB03	TSHS3*27	07-Mar-91	69	185	151		14	15			5	18.38%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB04D	TSHS3*29	08-Jan-91	14	192	145		15	22			10	24.48%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB04D	TSHS3*28	08-Jan-91	6	231	187		13	21			10	19.05%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB04D	TSHS3*30	08-Jan-91	29	231	179		13	22			17	22.51%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB05D	TSHS3*32	10-Jan-91	25	228	185		14	19			10	18.86%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB05D	TSHS3*31	10-Jan-91	6	210	186		11	1			12	11.43%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB05D	TSHS3*33	11-Jan-91	38	193	144		14	23			12	25.39%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB06D	TSHS3*34	13-Jan-91	0	170	147		10			1	12	12.94%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB06D	TSHS3*36	13-Jan-91	22	185	111		18	15			41	40.00%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB06D	TSHS3*35	13-Jan-91	10	192	145		15	22			10	24.48%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB07D	TSHS3*37	14-Jan-91	6	191	137		17	21			16	28.27%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB07D	TSHS3*39	15-Jan-91	32	192	141		13	22			16	26.56%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB07D	TSHS3*38	14-Jan-91	18	191	141		14	21			15	26.18%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB08	TSHS6*26	23-Jul-91	4	171	152		8	1			10	11.11%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB08	TSHS6*31	23-Jul-91	0	170	152		9				9	10.59%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB08	TSHS6*32	23-Jul-91	2	170	151		10				9	11.18%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB09	FTSHS6*3	24-Jul-91	4	180	152		9	10			9	15.56%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB09	TSHS6*40	24-Jul-91	28	189	149		15	19			6	21.16%
CSO	BORE	LF2	LF2SB09	TSHS6*39	24-Jul-91	20	184	151		12	14			7	17.93%
CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW01	TSHW6*14	13-Jul-91	24	167	148		9		1		9	10.78%
CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW01	TSHW3*22	02-Apr-91	12	167	148		7		1		11	10.78%
CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW02	TSHW3*23	02-Apr-91	34.9	170	144		11	3	1		11	14.71%
CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW03	TSHW3*24	09-Apr-91	35	168	105		7	1	1		54	36.90%
CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW04	TSHW3*25	03-Apr-91	68.5	168	148		9	1	1		9	11.31%
CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW05	TSHW3*27	03-Apr-91	50	168	149		7	1	1		10	10.71%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB01	TSHS3*41	04-Feb-91	10	177	76		13	18		1	69	56.50%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB01	TSHS3*40	04-Feb-91	2	160	119		14	1			26	25.63%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB01	TSHS3*42	05-Feb-91	18	177	107		15	18			37	39.55%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB02	TSHS3*45	11-Feb-91	34	180	131		11	21			17	27.22%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB02	TSHS3*43	10-Feb-91	2	159	141		13				5	11.32%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB02	TSHS3*44	10-Feb-91	20	175	120		12	16			27	31.43%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB03	TSHS3*47	28-Jan-91	30	181	128		13	22			18	29.28%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB03	TSHS3*48	28-Jan-91	34	106	79		12	1			14	25.47%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB03	TSHS3*46	27-Jan-91	1	159	127		15				17	20.13%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB04	TSHS3*50	04-Feb-91	34	174	124	1	16	15			18	28.16%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB04	TSHS3*49	04-Feb-91	0	159	117		19				23	26.42%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB04	TSHS3*51	04-Feb-91	59	173	105	1	15	14			38	38.73%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB04D	TSHS3*50	04-Feb-91	34	174	124	1	16	15			18	28.16%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB04D	TSHS3*49	04-Feb-91	0	159	117		19				23	26.42%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB04D	TSHS3*51	04-Feb-91	59	173	105	1	15	14			38	38.73%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB05	TSHS3*54	27-Jan-91	59	63	46		12				5	26.98%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB05	TSHS3*52	27-Jan-91	49	63	47		10				6	25.40%
CSO	BORE	LF3	LF3SB05	TSHS3*53	27-Jan-91	54	63	46		12				5	26.98%
CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW01	TSHW6*17	29-Aug-91	50.2	168	158		9	1				5.95%
CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW02	TSHW3*29	09-Apr-91	54	169	128		8	2	1		30	23.67%
CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW03	TSHW3*30	23-Mar-91	6.7	171	138		8	4	16		5	9.94%
CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW04	TSHW3*32	06-Apr-91	35	168	89		8	1	1		69	46.43%
CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW04S	TSHW3*31	06-Apr-91	12.5	168	90		6	1	1		70	45.83%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB01	TSHS3*56	25-Feb-91	62	173	108		15	14			36	37.57%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB01	TSHS3*55	24-Feb-91	28	179	133		16	20			10	25.70%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB02	TSHS3*58	19-Feb-91	16	159	135		12				12	15.09%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB02	TSHS3*60	20-Feb-91	54	161	135		13	2			11	16.15%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB02	TSHS3*59	20-Feb-91	48	169	135		11				13	14.20%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB03	TSHS3*61	06-Feb-91	2	174	77		18	15			64	55.75%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB03	TSHS3*63	06-Feb-91	14	176	76		14	17		1	68	56.25%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB03	TSHS3*62	06-Feb-91	66	174	77	1	14	15			67	55.17%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB04D	TSHS3*65	07-Feb-91	10	180	107		16	21			36	40.56%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB04D	TSHS3*64	07-Feb-91	6	178	119		18	19			22	33.15%
CSO	BORE	LF5	LF5SB04D	TSHS3*66	07-Feb-91	24	171	107		14	12			38	37.43%
CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW01	TSHW3*34	09-Apr-91	51.7	168	91		7	1	1		68	45.24%
CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW01	TSHW6*15	14-Jul-91	53	167	147		12		1		7	11.38%
CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW02	TSHW3*35	08-Apr-91	55.1	169	89		7	2	1		70	46.75%
CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW03	TSHW3*36	08-Apr-91	28.5	71	57		11		1		2	18.31%
CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW03	TSHW3*46	15-Apr-91	30.7	96	43						53	55.21%
CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW04	TSHW3*38	19-Apr-91	50	168	144		7	1	1		15	13.69%
CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW04S	TSHW3*37	19-Apr-91	24.6	169	145		7	2	1		14	13.61%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB01	TSHS3*67	20-Feb-91	4	160	134	1	13	1			11	15.63%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB01	TSHS3*68	20-Feb-91	29	161	125	1	15	2			18	21.74%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB02	TSHS3*70	12-Feb-91	29	178	130		12	19			17	26.97%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB02	TSHS3*72	12-Feb-91	54	175	139		11	16			9	20.57%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB02	TSHS3*71	12-Feb-91	49	170	119		13	11			27	30.00%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB03	TSHS3*73	06-Feb-91	1	159	127		14			1	17	19.50%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB03	TSHS3*74	07-Feb-91	29	177	126		16	18			17	28.81%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB03	TSHS3*75	07-Feb-91	54	181	127		16	22			16	29.83%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB04D	TSHS3*78	04-Mar-91	59	170	141		13	11			5	17.06%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB04D	TSHS3*77	04-Mar-91	29	174	141		13	15			5	18.97%
CSO	BORE	LF6	LF6SB04D	TSHS3*76	09-Feb-91	14	159	132		14				13	16.98%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7G-101	TSHW3*42	22-Apr-91	35.3	169	144		7	2	1		15	14.20%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7G-102	TSHW3*43	22-Apr-91	35	172	143		9	5	1		14	16.28%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7G-104	TSHW3*44	23-Apr-91	14.9	170	144		8	3	1		14	14.71%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW01	TSHW3*39	09-Apr-91	58	170	135		9	3	1		22	20.00%

TABLE 1: Remedial Investigation Samples with Data Qualifiers															
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal															
						Sample	Number	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below							
Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Depth (feet)	of Analytes	None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW01	TSHW6*16	15-Jul-91	58	167	149		9		1		8	10.18%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW02	TSHW3*40	17-Apr-91	29.2	168	98		6	1	1		62	41.07%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW03	TSHW3*41	16-Apr-91	31.8	173	84		8	6	1		74	50.87%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW04	FTSHW3*7	07-Mar-91	5	3	3							0.00%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW04	FTSHW3*4	11-Feb-91	5	165	155		3		1		6	5.45%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW04S	FTSHW3*3	26-Feb-91	1.5	166	153		4		1		8	7.23%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW05	FTSHW3*6	11-Feb-91	38.5	177	153		7	12	1		4	12.99%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW05	FTSHW3*8	27-Feb-91	14	2	2							0.00%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW05S	FTSHW3*5	11-Mar-91	8.2	171	135	1	4	4	2		25	19.30%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW06	FTSHW6*6	09-Aug-91	13	167	133		8		2		24	19.16%
CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW06S	FTSHW6*5	09-Aug-91	8.5	168	132		9	1	2		24	20.24%
CSO	STSW	LF7	LF7LCS	TSHS5*15	16-May-91	17.1	171	137		15	12			7	19.88%
CSO	STSW	LF7	LF7LCS	TSHS5*15	16-May-91	0.6	171	137		15	12			7	19.88%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB01	TSHS3*81	22-Feb-91	54	170	120		13	11			26	29.41%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB01	TSHS3*80	21-Feb-91	24	175	116		13	16			30	33.71%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB01	TSHS3*79	21-Feb-91	4	161	141		14	2			4	12.42%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB02	TSHS3*82	22-Feb-91	6	161	142		12	2			5	11.80%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB02	TSHS3*83	22-Feb-91	16	175	142		13	16			4	18.86%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB02	TSHS3*84	22-Feb-91	24	175	142		14	16			3	18.86%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB03	TSHS3*86	10-Mar-91	19	176	142		15	17			2	19.32%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB03	TSHS3*87	10-Mar-91	29	159	142		15				2	10.69%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB03	TSHS3*85	10-Mar-91	0	159	143		14				2	10.06%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB04D	TSHS3*89	23-Jan-91	4	181	141		13	22			5	22.10%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB04D	TSHS3*90	23-Jan-91	34	181	143		9	22			7	20.99%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB04D	TSHS3*88	23-Jan-91	0	159	143		9				7	10.06%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB05D	TSHS3*92	26-Jan-91	20	63	46		13				4	26.98%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB05D	TSHS3*93	26-Jan-91	38	63	26		10				27	58.73%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB05D	TSHS3*91	26-Jan-91	4	63	47		11				5	25.40%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB06D	TSHS6*43	25-Jul-91	30	179	139		14	20			6	22.35%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB06D	TSHS6*41	25-Jul-91	2	160	142		9	1			8	11.25%
CSO	BORE	LF7	LF7SB06D	TSHS6*42	25-Jul-91	18	179	139		13	20			7	22.35%
CSO	LAFL	LF7	LF7SEEPN	TSHS5*16	02-May-91	0	178	140	1	14	19			4	20.79%
CSO	LAFL	LF7	LF7SEEPS	TSHS5*17	02-May-91	0	169	139		15	10			5	17.75%
CSO	BASN	LF7	SB-LF7	TSHS5*30	13-May-91	0	159	129		9		9	4	8	10.69%
CSW	SUMP	LF7	LF7LCS	TSHW5*36	16-May-91	13.8	167	139		10		1		17	16.17%
CSW	LAFL	LF7	LF7SEEPN	TSHW5*34	02-May-91	0	169	87		12	2	66		2	9.47%
CSW	LAFL	LF7	LF7SEEPS	TSHW5*35	02-May-91	0	178	148		12	11	1		6	16.29%
CSW	BASN	LF7	SB-LF7	TSHW5*25	13-May-91	0	167	133		10		1		23	19.76%
CSO	BORE	NIKEMFP	MFPSB01	TSHS1*54	25-Jan-91	1	173	113		18	5			37	34.68%
CSO	BORE	NIKEMFP	MFPSB01	TSHS1*55	25-Jan-91	14	188	135		16	20			17	28.19%
CSO	BORE	NIKEMFP	MFPSB01	TSHS1*56	26-Jan-91	34	186	114		14	18			40	38.71%
CSO	PIT	NIKEMFP	MFPTP1	TSHS4*89	08-Mar-91	2.5	173	143		15	3			12	17.34%
CSO	PIT	NIKEMFP	MFPTP1	TSHS4*90	08-Mar-91	14	185	145		13	15			12	21.62%
CSO	PIT	NIKEMFP	MFPTP2	TSHS4*91	24-Feb-91	7	177	141		14	8			14	20.34%
CSO	PIT	NIKEMFP	MFPTP2	TSHS4*92	24-Feb-91	14.5	189	141		14	19			15	25.40%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	NMSEW-B	FTSHS7*1	26-Jul-91	14	105	92			2			11	12.38%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	NMSF-B1	TSHS7*12	26-Jul-91	17	133	107		12	7			7	19.55%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	NMSNW-B	FTSHS7*2	26-Jul-91	12	105	92			2			11	12.38%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	NMSWW-B	FTSHS7*3	26-Jul-91	13.5	105	92			2			11	12.38%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	SMSEW-B	FTSHS7*8	26-Jul-91	14	104	92			1			11	11.54%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	SMSNW-B	TSHS7*10	26-Jul-91	15	103	92						11	10.68%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	SMSSW-B	FTSHS7*9	26-Jul-91	14.5	103	92						11	10.68%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	SMSWW-B	TSHS7*11	26-Jul-91	12.5	103	93						10	9.71%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	WMSEW-B	FTSHS7*4	26-Jul-91	14	104	92			1			11	11.54%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	WMSNW-B	FTSHS7*6	26-Jul-91	12.5	104	92			1			11	11.54%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	WMSSW-B	FTSHS7*5	26-Jul-91	14	105	92			2			11	12.38%
CBI	BLDG	NIKESILO	WMSWW-	FTSHS7*7	26-Jul-91	14	104	92			1			11	11.54%
CSW	STWA	NIKESILO	N.MISSLE.	TSHW5*47	17-May-91	6	27	5						22	81.48%
CSW	STWA	NIKESILO	N.MISSLE.	TSHW1*25	26-Mar-91	0	131	124			2			5	5.34%
CSO	OTFL	OFFICER	C-4810	TSHS5*35	02-May-91	0	181	137		13	22			9	24.31%
CSW	OTFL	OFFICER	C-4810	TSHW5*30	02-May-91	0	167	148		10		1		8	10.78%
CSO	OTFL	SCOTLOO	OD-2	TSHS5*34	01-May-91	0	180	136		15	23			6	24.44%
CSW	OTFL	SCOTLOO	OD-2	TSHW5*29	01-May-91	0	168	146		11	1	1		9	12.50%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-0039	FTSHS5*5	19-May-91	5.4	161	87		15	2		1	56	45.34%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-0039	FTSHS5*5	19-May-91	0.2	161	87		15	2		1	56	45.34%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-3870	TSHS5*12	14-May-91	-5.2	39	35						4	10.26%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-3870	TSHS5*37	16-May-91	0.2	149	98		10		9	3	29	26.17%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-3870	TSHS5*37	16-May-91	5.2	149	98		10		9	3	29	26.17%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-4100	TSHS5*19	15-May-91	-5.2	195	132		11	7	9	3	33	26.15%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-4100	TSHS5*19	15-May-91	-0.2	195	132		11	7	9	3	33	26.15%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-4510	TSHS5*11	20-May-91	8.1	39	35						4	10.26%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-4590	TSHS5*13	15-May-91	-0.2	198	143		11	10		4	30	25.76%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-4590	TSHS5*13	15-May-91	-7.1	198	143		11	10		4	30	25.76%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-5810	TSHS5*25	17-May-91	9.1	159	129		9		9	4	8	10.69%
CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-5810	TSHS5*25	17-May-91	0.3	159	129		9		9	4	8	10.69%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-0039	FTSHW5*5	19-May-91	5.4	176	141		6	9	1		19	19.32%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-2560	FTSHW5*8	19-May-91	25.7	181	147		6	14	1		13	18.23%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-2760	FTSHW5*9	16-May-91	11	168	132		10	1	1		24	20.83%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-3870	TSHW5*11	14-May-91	-5	196	145		10		1		40	25.51%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-3940	TSHW5*15	14-May-91	-5.3	197	144		11	1	1		40	26.40%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-4100	TSHW5*14	15-May-91	-4.8	196	154		10		1		31	20.92%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-4510	TSHW5*10	20-May-91	5.5	196	149		5		1		41	23.47%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-4570	TSHW5*13	16-May-91	3.5	170	119		11	3	17		20	20.00%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-4590	TSHW5*12	15-May-91	-6.9	223	152		14	27	1		29	31.39%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-5730	TSHW5*21	18-May-91	9.8	167	134		5		1		27	19.16%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-5810	TSHW5*20	17-May-91	9.1	167	139		10		1		17	16.17%

TABLE 1: Remedial Investigation Samples with Data Qualifiers
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal

Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Sample Depth (feet)	Number of Analytes	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below: None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-6130	TSHW5*22	19-May-91	33	167	148		6		1		12	10.78%
CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-6331	TSHW5*19	17-May-91	7.5	167	135	1	13		1		17	17.96%
CSO	OTFL	SHENCK	OD-3	TSHS5*36	13-May-91	0	161	141		7	2		3	8	10.56%
CSW	OTFL	SHENCK	OD-3	TSHW5*31	13-May-91	0	173	133		10	6	1		23	22.54%
CSO	TRIP	TRIPBLNK	TB04	TSHSTB*4	27-Nov-90	0									#DIV/0!
CSO	TRIP	TRIPBLNK	TB05	TSHSTB*5	28-Nov-90	0									#DIV/0!
CSO	TRIP	TRIPBLNK	TB06	TSHSTB*6	29-Nov-90	0									#DIV/0!
CSO	DTCH	VANHORN	C-5030	TSHS5*22	02-May-91	0	161	144		7	2		3	5	8.70%
CSO	DTCH	VANHORN	C-5360	TSHS5*23	02-May-91	0	174	145		7	15		3	4	14.94%
CSW	DTCH	VANHORN	C-5030	TSHW5*17	02-May-91	0	167	149	1	9		1		7	9.58%
CSW	DTCH	VANHORN	C-5360	TSHW5*18	02-May-91	0	167	149		10		1		7	10.18%
CSO	PIT	VES1	VES1TP1	TSHS4*20	26-Feb-91	7.5	143	122		1	8			12	14.69%
CSO	PIT	VES1	VES1TP1	TSHS4*19	26-Feb-91	2.5	135	132						3	2.22%
CSO	PIT	VES1	VES1TP2	TSHS4*22	25-Feb-91	7	141	122		1	6			12	13.48%
CSO	PIT	VES1	VES1TP2	TSHS4*21	25-Feb-91	2.5	135	132						3	2.22%
CSO	PIT	VES1	VES1TP3	TSHS4*24	26-Feb-91	8	153	134			18			1	12.42%
CSO	PIT	VES1	VES1TP3	TSHS4*23	26-Feb-91	2.5	136	133			1			2	2.21%
CSO	PIT	VES2	VES2TP1	TSHS4*25	22-Feb-91	2.5	136	132			1			3	2.94%
CSO	PIT	VES2	VES2TP1	TSHS4*26	22-Feb-91	7.2	136	133			1			2	2.21%
CSO	PIT	VES2	VES2TP2	TSHS4*28	22-Feb-91	7	141	131			7			3	7.09%
CSO	PIT	VES2	VES2TP2	TSHS4*27	22-Feb-91	2.5	137	131			3			3	4.38%
CSO	PIT	VES5	VES5TP1	TSHS4*29	20-Feb-91	2.5	142	126			7			9	11.27%
CSO	PIT	VES5	VES5TP1	TSHS4*30	20-Feb-91	8	135	126						9	6.67%
CSO	PIT	VES5	VES5TP2	TSHS4*31	20-Feb-91	2.5	135	126						9	6.67%
CSO	PIT	VES5	VES5TP2	TSHS4*32	20-Feb-91	7	135	126						9	6.67%
CSO	PIT	VES5	VES5TP3	TSHS4*33	21-Feb-91	2.5	135	126						9	6.67%
CSO	PIT	VES5	VES5TP3	TSHS4*34	21-Feb-91	14.5	152	116	1	1	17			17	23.03%
CSO	PIT	VES5	VES5TP4	TSHS4*36	06-Mar-91	7	140	132			5			3	5.71%
CSO	PIT	VES5	VES5TP4	TSHS4*35	06-Mar-91	2	135	132						3	2.22%
CSO	BORE	VES6	VES6SB01	TSHS1*35	23-Jan-91	4	143	121			8			14	15.38%
CSO	BORE	VES6	VES6SB01	TSHS1*36	23-Jan-91	10	154	121			19			14	21.43%
CSO	BORE	VES6	VES6SB01	TSHS1*34	23-Jan-91	1	137	121			2			14	11.68%
CSO	PIT	VES6	VES6TP1	TSHS4*38	05-Mar-91	8	136	132			1			3	2.94%
CSO	PIT	VES6	VES6TP1	TSHS4*37	05-Mar-91	3	141	132			6			3	6.38%
CSO	PIT	VES6	VES6TP2	TSHS4*39	05-Mar-91	2	135	132						3	2.22%
CSO	PIT	VES6	VES6TP2	TSHS4*40	05-Mar-91	7	140	132			5			3	5.71%
CSO	PIT	VES6	VES6TP3	TSHS4*41	12-Feb-91	2	141	131			6			4	7.09%
CSO	PIT	VES6	VES6TP3	TSHS4*41	12-Feb-91	1.9	141	131			6			4	7.09%
CSO	PIT	VES6	VES6TP3	TSHS4*42	12-Feb-91	6.4	135	110		1				24	18.52%
CSO	PIT	VES7	VES7TP1	TSHS4*48	24-Feb-91	7	140	132			5			3	5.71%
CSO	PIT	VES7	VES7TP1	TSHS4*47	24-Feb-91	2.5	135	132						3	2.22%
CSO	PIT	VES7	VES7TP2	TSHS4*46	23-Feb-91	7	136	132			1			3	2.94%
CSO	PIT	VES7	VES7TP2	TSHS4*45	23-Feb-91	1.5	135	132						3	2.22%
CSO	PIT	VES7	VES7TP3	TSHS4*44	23-Feb-91	7	143	123		2	8			10	13.99%
CSO	PIT	VES7	VES7TP3	TSHS4*43	23-Feb-91	2.5	136	131			1			4	3.68%
CSO	PIT	VES9	VES9TP1	TSHS4*49	07-Mar-91	1.6	135	132						3	2.22%
CSO	PIT	VES9	VES9TP1	TSHS4*50	07-Mar-91	7	136	132			1			3	2.94%
CSO	PIT	VES9	VES9TP2	TSHS4*51	07-Mar-91	2	135	132						3	2.22%
CSO	PIT	VES9	VES9TP2	TSHS4*52	07-Mar-91	7	137	132			2			3	3.65%
CSO	PIT	VES9	VES9TP3	TSHS4*54	07-Mar-91	3	165	123			30			12	25.45%
CSO	PIT	VES9	VES9TP3	TSHS4*53	07-Mar-91	1.7	149	123			14			12	17.45%
CSO	PIT	VES9	VES9TP4	TSHS4*55	08-Mar-91	3	135	123						12	8.89%
CSO	PIT	VES9	VES9TP4	TSHS4*56	08-Mar-91	7.5	142	123			7			12	13.38%
CSO	STSW	WELLS	AI10-36	TSHS5*28	17-May-91	0.2	159	130		7		9	5	8	9.43%
CSO	STSW	WELLS	AI10-36	TSHS5*28	17-May-91	6.5	159	130		7		9	5	8	9.43%
CSO	OTFL	WELLS	LF7BP1	TSHS5*38	03-May-91	0	162	140		10	3		2	7	12.35%
CSW	STSW	WELLS	AI10-18	TSHW5*24	17-May-91	6	167	139		10		1		17	16.17%
CSW	STSW	WELLS	AI10-36	TSHW5*23	17-May-91	6.5	167	139		10		1		17	16.17%
CSW	OTFL	WELLS	LF7BP1	TSHW5*33	03-May-91	0	167	147		11		1		8	11.38%

Legend:

CBI	Building Interior	DTCH	Ditch
CGW	Groundwater	LAFL	Landfill
CSE	Sediments	MAHO	Manhole
CSO	Soils	OTFL	Outfall
CSW	Surface Water	STSW	Storm Sewer
BASN	Basin	STWA	Standing Water
BLDG	Building	TRIP	Trip Blank
CONC	Concrete	WIPE	Wipe
DRWM	Drill water source	WOOD	Wood

TABLE 2: Fort Sheridan 1990-1991 RI Samples with Rejected Analytes During Data Validation

Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal

(Legend of abbreviations at end of table.)

Rejected?	Resample?	Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Sample Depth (feet)	Number of Analytes	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below | None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J	Rejected Analyte 1	Rejected Analyte 2
No	No	CSW	OTFL	AIRPORT	C-0300	TSHW5*27	01-May-91	0	182	123	1	9	6	1		42	31.32%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B115	B115MW01	FTSHW1*1	15-Apr-91	19.8	159	119		6	1	1		32	24.53%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B122	B122MW01	FTSHW6*1	23-Jul-91	12	188	144		9	2	1		32	22.87%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B122	B122MW02	TSHW6*22	23-Jul-91	11.5	190	143		9	4	1		33	24.21%	MEK	
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B122	122F1WP1	FTSHS2*6	15-Nov-90	0	124	84			6	2		32	30.65%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B122	122F1WP2	FTSHS2*7	15-Nov-90	0	118	84				2		32	27.12%	24DNP	46DN2CR
Yes	Yes	CSO	BORE	B122	B122BLK	FTSHS2*8	15-Nov-90	0	119	84			1	2		32	27.73%	24DNP	46DN2CR
Yes	Yes	CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*4	10-Jul-91	1	187	100		15	1	35		36	27.81%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*6	10-Jul-91	9	187	113		13	1	35	1	24	20.32%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*5	10-Jul-91	4	191	109		14	5	35		28	24.61%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB11	FTSHS6*7	10-Jul-91	4	186	99		14		35	1	37	27.42%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB12	TSHS6*11	10-Jul-91	9	188	99		15	2	35	1	36	28.19%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB13	TSHS6*13	10-Jul-91	1	187	94		7	1	44	4	37	24.06%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	BORE	B122	B122SB13	TSHS6*14	10-Jul-91	4	187	100		13	1	35	1	37	27.27%	NC	NC
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW01	FTSHW1*6	08-Feb-91	26.1	159	150		2	1	1		5	5.03%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW01B	FTSHW1*4	12-Dec-90	9	161	131		9	3	12		6	11.18%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW01B	FTSHW1*4	12-Dec-90	5.7	161	131		9	3	12		6	11.18%	NC	NC
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW02	FTSHW1*5	11-Jan-91	5.7	164	149		5	6	4			6.71%	NC	NC
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B125	B125MW04	TSHW6*24	14-Nov-91	10	158	140		7		2		9	10.13%	MEK	MIBK
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B137	137F1WP1	FTSHS2*9	14-Nov-90	0	120	98		4		2	6	10	11.67%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B137	137F1WP2	TSHS2*10	14-Nov-90	0	137	95		5	18	2	7	10	24.09%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	No	CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP2	TSHS4*59	25-Mar-91	3	161	135		15	2	1		8	15.53%	MEK	
No	No	CSO	PIT	B137	B137TP2	TSHS4*60	25-Mar-91	6.7	160	134		13	1	1	1	10	15.00%	MEK	
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B139	139F1WP1	TSHS2*11	14-Nov-90	0	132	96		5	13	2	6	10	21.21%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B139	139F1WP2	TSHS2*12	14-Nov-90	0	124	97		4	5	2	6	10	15.32%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B139	B139BLK	TSHS2*13	14-Nov-90	0	133	99		3	14	2	5	10	20.30%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW01	FTSHW1*7	02-Apr-91	5.6	183	133		13	25	1		11	26.78%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW02	FTSHW1*8	11-Jan-91	8.9	162	149		5	4	4			5.56%	NC	NC
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW03	FTSHW1*9	11-Feb-91	22.4	160	151		1	2	1		5	5.00%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW04	TSHW1*10	11-Feb-91	14.9	162	145		4	4	1		8	9.88%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW05	FTSHW6*2	24-Jul-91	23.3	160	148		7	2	1		2	6.88%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW06	FTSHW6*3	29-Jul-91	23	159	144		7	1	1		6	8.81%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW07	FTSHW6*4	24-Jul-91	23.3	158	149		6		1		2	5.06%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B208	B208MW08	TSHW6*23	29-Jul-91	23	158	143		8		1		6	8.86%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CSO	PIT	B216	B216TP1			4						All					
Yes	Yes	CSO	PIT	B216	B216TP1			7						All					
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B361	361F1WP1	TSHS2*23	14-Nov-90	0	159	138		3		2	6	10	8.18%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B361	361F1WP2	TSHS2*24	14-Nov-90	0	158	136		4		2	6	10	8.86%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	No	CSO	WIPE	B361	361F1WP3	TSHS2*25	14-Nov-90	0	158	137		3		2	6	10	8.23%	24DNP	46DN2CR
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	B368	B368MW02	TSHW1*15	22-Mar-91	8	135	131				1		3	2.22%	MEK	
Yes	No	CSR	MAHO	B43	B43CS1	FTSHS2*1	13-Dec-90	5	185	41		32	28	60		24	45.41%	NC	NC
No	No	CSR	MAHO	B43	B43CS1	FTSHW2*1	12-Dec-90	5	158	94		4	24	1		35	39.87%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	DTCH	BARTLETT	C-2370	FTSHW5*7	01-May-91	0	181	146	2	10	14	1		8	17.68%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	OTFL	BARTLETT	C-3290	TSHW5*16	15-May-91	0	197	153	1	12	1	1		29	21.32%	MEK	
No	No	CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW01	TSHDW1*1	08-Nov-90	-3	198	166		2	2	2		26	15.15%	MEK	Cyanide
No	No	CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW02	TSHDW1*2	08-Nov-90	-3	200	124		9	4	1		62	37.50%	Cyanide	
Yes	No	CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW03	TSHDW1*3	13-Dec-90	-3	200	146		2	3	12		37	21.00%	NC	NC
No	No	CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW04	TSHDW1*4	13-Dec-90	-3	199	160		3	2	1		33	19.10%	MEK	
No	No	CGW	DRWM	DRILLH2O	DW05	TSHDW1*5	28-Jan-91	-4	198	149		8	1	2		38	23.74%	MEK	4Nanil
No	No	CSW	DTCH	HUTCHIN	C-0690	TSHW5*28	01-May-91	0	176	122		12		1		41	30.11%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	OTFL	HUTCHIN	C-0692	TSHW5*26	15-May-91	0	176	158		10		1		7	9.66%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	DTCH	HUTCHIN	C-0732	FTSHW5*6	02-May-91	0	168	148	1	10	1	1		7	10.71%	MEK	

TABLE 2: Fort Sheridan 1990-1991 RI Samples with Rejected Analytes During Data Validation
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal
(Legend of abbreviations at end of table.)

Rejected?	Resample?	Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Sample Depth (feet)	Number of Analytes	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below | None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J	Rejected Analyte 1	Rejected Analyte 2
Yes	Yes	CSO	DTCH	JANES	C-0130	FTSHS5*1	30-Apr-91	0	196	146		18	9	2	1	20	23.98%	AR1016	AR1260
Yes	Yes	CSO	DTCH	JANES	C-0242	FTSHS5*3	18-May-91	0	198	116		10	10	15	4	43	31.82%	NC	NC
No	No	CSW	DTCH	JANES	C-0031	FTSHW5*2	30-Apr-91	0	196	153	1	10		1		31	20.92%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	DTCH	JANES	C-0130	FTSHW5*1	30-Apr-91	0	196	153		12		1		30	21.43%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	DTCH	JANES	C-0242	FTSHW5*3	18-May-91	0	208	147		11	12	1		37	26.85%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	OTFL	JANES	OD-1	FTSHW5*4	01-May-91	0	196	119	1	9		1		66	38.27%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW01	TSHW6*11	15-Jul-91	39	167	149		8		1		9	10.18%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW01	TSHW3*45	26-Mar-91	33	168	142		7	1	1		17	14.88%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW02	FTSHW3*9	22-Mar-91	33	170	152		7	3	1		7	10.00%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW03D	FTSHW3*2	12-Feb-91	50	166	152		4		1		9	7.83%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW03S	FTSHW3*1	26-Feb-91	14	185	137		5	19	16		8	17.30%	NC	NC
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF1	LF1MW04	TSHW3*10	23-Mar-91	19.6	169	152		7	2	1		7	9.47%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW01	TSHW6*12	16-Jul-91	42	180	156		9	4	1		10	12.78%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW01	TSHW3*11	17-Apr-91	39	177	102		10	1	1		63	41.81%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW02	TSHW6*13	13-Jul-91	26	171	147		11	4	1		8	13.45%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW02	TSHW3*12	04-Apr-91	16.2	180	156		9	4	1		10	12.78%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW04D	TSHW3*15	15-Apr-91	26.6	176	103		9		1		63	40.91%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW04S	TSHW3*14	07-Mar-91	7.1	179	92	1	3	3	2		78	46.93%	MEK	2CEVether
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW05D	TSHW3*17	15-Apr-91	28	177	105		6	1	1		64	40.11%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW05S	TSHW3*16	25-Mar-91	9.4	176	153		7		1		15	12.50%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW06D	TSHW3*19	18-Apr-91	22	176	152		8		1		15	13.07%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW06S	TSHW6*20	07-Aug-91	8.5	178	151	1	10	2	1		13	14.04%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW06S	TSHW3*18	25-Mar-91	7	176	153		7		1		15	12.50%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW07D	TSHW3*21	05-Apr-91	31.9	196	157		10	20	1		8	19.39%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW07S	TSHW3*20	07-Mar-91	4.3	177	104	1	3	1	2		66	39.55%	MEK	2CEVether
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW08D	FTSHW6*8	09-Aug-91	29	176	141		10		2		23	18.75%	MEK	Benzoic A
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW08S	FTSHW6*7	06-Aug-91	7.1	177	152		10	1	1		13	13.56%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF2	LF2MW09S	FTSHW6*9	06-Aug-91	7.3	176	153		9		1		13	12.50%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW01	TSHW6*14	13-Jul-91	24	167	148		9		1		9	10.78%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW01	TSHW3*22	02-Apr-91	12	167	148		7		1		11	10.78%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW02	TSHW3*23	02-Apr-91	34.9	170	144		11	3	1		11	14.71%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW03	TSHW3*24	09-Apr-91	35	168	105		7	1	1		54	36.90%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW04D	TSHW3*25	03-Apr-91	68.5	168	148		9	1	1		9	11.31%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF3	LF3MW05	TSHW3*27	03-Apr-91	50	168	149		7	1	1		10	10.71%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW02	TSHW3*29	09-Apr-91	54	169	128		8	2	1		30	23.67%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW03	TSHW3*30	23-Mar-91	6.7	171	138		8	4	16		5	9.94%	NC	NC
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW04D	TSHW3*32	06-Apr-91	35	168	89		8	1	1		69	46.43%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF5	LF5MW04S	TSHW3*31	06-Apr-91	12.5	168	90		6	1	1		70	45.83%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW01	TSHW3*34	09-Apr-91	51.7	168	91		7	1	1		68	45.24%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW01	TSHW6*15	14-Jul-91	53	167	147		12		1		7	11.38%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW02	TSHW3*35	08-Apr-91	55.1	169	89		7	2	1		70	46.75%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW03	TSHW3*36	08-Apr-91	28.5	71	57		11		1		2	18.31%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW04D	TSHW3*38	19-Apr-91	50	168	144		7	1	1		15	13.69%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF6	LF6MW04S	TSHW3*37	19-Apr-91	24.6	169	145		7	2	1		14	13.61%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7G-101	TSHW3*42	22-Apr-91	35.3	169	144		7	2	1		15	14.20%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7G-102	TSHW3*43	22-Apr-91	35	172	143		9	5	1		14	16.28%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7G-104	TSHW3*44	23-Apr-91	14.9	170	144		8	3	1		14	14.71%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW01	TSHW3*39	09-Apr-91	58	170	135		9	3	1		22	20.00%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW01	TSHW6*16	15-Jul-91	58	167	149		9		1		8	10.18%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW02	TSHW3*40	17-Apr-91	29.2	168	98		6	1	1		62	41.07%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW03	TSHW3*41	16-Apr-91	31.8	173	84		8	6	1		74	50.87%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW04D	FTSHW3*4	11-Feb-91	5	165	155		3		1		6	5.45%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW04S	FTSHW3*3	26-Feb-91	1.5	166	153		4		1		8	7.23%	MEK	

TABLE 2: Fort Sheridan 1990-1991 RI Samples with Rejected Analytes During Data Validation

Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal

(Legend of abbreviations at end of table.)

Rejected?	Resample?	Media	Site Type	Site	Site ID	Sample Number	Sample Date	Sample Depth (feet)	Number of Analytes	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below: None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J	Rejected Analyte 1	Rejected Analyte 2
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW05D	FTSHW3*6	11-Feb-91	38.5	177	153		7	12	1		4	12.99%	MEK	
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW05S	FTSHW3*5	11-Mar-91	8.2	171	135	1	4	4	2		25	19.30%	MEK	2CEVether
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW06D	FTSHW6*6	09-Aug-91	13	167	133		8		2		24	19.16%	MEK	Benzoic A
No	Yes	CGW	WELL	LF7	LF7MW06S	FTSHW6*5	09-Aug-91	8.5	168	132		9	1	2		24	20.24%	MEK	Benzoic A
Yes	Yes	CSO	BASN	LF7	SB-LF7	TSHS5*30	13-May-91	0	159	129		9		9	4	8	10.69%	NC	NC
No	No	CSW	SUMP	LF7	LF7LCS	TSHW5*36	16-May-91	13.8	167	139		10		1		17	16.17%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CSW	LAFL	LF7	LF7SEEPNW	TSHW5*34	02-May-91	0	169	87		12	2	66		2	9.47%	NC	NC
No	No	CSW	LAFL	LF7	LF7SEEPSW	TSHW5*35	02-May-91	0	178	148		12	11	1		6	16.29%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	BASN	LF7	SB-LF7	TSHW5*25	13-May-91	0	167	133		10		1		23	19.76%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	OTFL	OFFICER	C-4810	TSHW5*30	02-May-91	0	167	148		10		1		8	10.78%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	OTFL	SCOTLOOP	OD-2	TSHW5*29	01-May-91	0	168	146		11	1	1		9	12.50%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-3870	TSHS5*37	16-May-91	0.2	149	98		10		9	3	29	26.17%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-3870	TSHS5*37	16-May-91	5.2	149	98		10		9	3	29	26.17%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-4100	TSHS5*19	15-May-91	-5.2	195	132		11	7	9	3	33	26.15%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-4100	TSHS5*19	15-May-91	-0.2	195	132		11	7	9	3	33	26.15%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-5810	TSHS5*25	17-May-91	9.1	159	129		9		9	4	8	10.69%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	STSW	SEWER	MH-5810	TSHS5*25	17-May-91	0.3	159	129		9		9	4	8	10.69%	NC	NC
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-0039	FTSHW5*5	19-May-91	5.4	176	141		6	9	1		19	19.32%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-2560	FTSHW5*8	19-May-91	25.7	181	147		6	14	1		13	18.23%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-2760	FTSHW5*9	16-May-91	11	168	132		10	1	1		24	20.83%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-3870	TSHW5*11	14-May-91	-5	196	145		10		1		40	25.51%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-3940	TSHW5*15	14-May-91	-5.3	197	144		11	1	1		40	26.40%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-4100	TSHW5*14	15-May-91	-4.8	196	154		10		1		31	20.92%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-4510	TSHW5*10	20-May-91	5.5	196	149		5		1		41	23.47%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-4570	TSHW5*13	16-May-91	3.5	170	119		11	3	17		20	20.00%	NC	NC
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-4590	TSHW5*12	15-May-91	-6.9	223	152		14	27	1		29	31.39%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-5730	TSHW5*21	18-May-91	9.8	167	134		5		1		27	19.16%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-5810	TSHW5*20	17-May-91	9.1	167	139		10		1		17	16.17%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-6130	TSHW5*22	19-May-91	33	167	148		6		1		12	10.78%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	SEWER	MH-6331	TSHW5*19	17-May-91	7.5	167	135	1	13		1		17	17.96%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	OTFL	SHENCK	OD-3	TSHW5*31	13-May-91	0	173	133		10	6	1		23	22.54%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	DTCH	VANHORNE	C-5030	TSHW5*17	02-May-91	0	167	149	1	9		1		7	9.58%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	DTCH	VANHORNE	C-5360	TSHW5*18	02-May-91	0	167	149		10		1		7	10.18%	MEK	
Yes	Yes	CSO	STSW	WELLS	AI10-36	TSHS5*28	17-May-91	0.2	159	130		7		9	5	8	9.43%	NC	NC
Yes	Yes	CSO	STSW	WELLS	AI10-36	TSHS5*28	17-May-91	6.5	159	130		7		9	5	8	9.43%	NC	NC
No	No	CSW	STSW	WELLS	AI10-18	TSHW5*24	17-May-91	6	167	139		10		1		17	16.17%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	STSW	WELLS	AI10-36	TSHW5*23	17-May-91	6.5	167	139		10		1		17	16.17%	MEK	
No	No	CSW	OTFL	WELLS	LF7BP1	TSHW5*33	03-May-91	0	167	147		11		1		8	11.38%	MEK	

Legend:

2CEVether	2 chloroethyl vinyl ether
46DN2CR	4,4-dinitro-2-cresol
4NAnil	4 Nitro aniline
AR1260	PCB 1260
BASN	Basin
Benzoic A	Benzoic Acid
BLDG	Building
CBI	Building Interior
CGW	Groundwater
CONC	Concrete
CSE	Sediments
CSO	Soils

		TABLE 2: Fort Sheridan 1990-1991 RI Samples with Rejected Analytes During Data Validation																	
		Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal																	
		(Legend of abbreviations at end of table.)																	
								Sample	Number	Number of analytes with qualifier type shown below								Rejected	Rejected
		Media	Site	Site	Site ID	Sample	Sample Date	Depth	of									Analyte 1	Analyte 2
Rejected?	Resample?		Type			Number		(feet)	Analytes	None	B	J	NJ	R	U	UJ	%J		
		CSW		Surface Water															
		DRWM		Drill water source															
		DTCH		Ditch															
		LAFL		Landfill															
		MAHO		Manhole															
		MEK		Methyl Ethyl Ketone															
		MIBK		Mehtyl Isobutyl ketone															
		NC		Rejected analytes not checked/listed															
		OTFL		Outfall															
		STSW		Storm Sewer															
		STWA		Standing Water															
		TRIP		Trip Blank															
		WIPE		Wipe															
		WOOD		Wood															

Table 3: Detections of Problem/Rejected Analytes					
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal					
Media	Site ID	Depth(ft)	Test name	Value	Units
CGW	B122MW02	11.5	CYN	3.39	ug/L
CGW	DW05	-4	CYN	2	ug/L
CGW	LF2MW04S	7.1	CYN	2	ug/L
CGW	LF2MW08S	7.1	CYN	2	ug/L
CSO	CSA1SB01	24	CYN	7.82	ug/g
CSO	VES2TP02	2.5	PCB1260	8.9	ug/g
CSO	VES2TP02	7	PCB1260	11	ug/g
CSW	MH-6331	7.5	CYN	3	ug/L
CSW	C-3290	0	CYN	3.22	ug/L
CSW	LF7SEEPS	0	CYN	3.52	ug/L
CSW	MH-2560	25.7	CYN	36	ug/L
CSW	MH-4590	6.9	CYN	3.68	ug/L
Legend:					
CGW	Chemical Ground Water				
CSE	Chemical Sediments				
CSO	Chemical Soils				
CSW	Chemical Surface Water				
CYN	Cyanide				

Table 4:	Resampling Sites at Ft. Sheridan															
Ft. Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal																
							Analyses Present									
Resamp	Media			Field	Sample	Depth			Pest/	Herb						
Number	Type	Site	Site ID	Samp No.	Date	(ft)	Metals	PCB	Herb	(24D)	PAHs	Reason				
Replacement Samples: The following samples will replace original 1990-1991 data that has been judged invalid.																
R1	CSO	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*4	10-Jul-91	1						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R2	CSO	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*6	10-Jul-91	9						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R3	CSO	B122	B122SB10	FTSHS6*5	10-Jul-91	4						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R4	CSO	B122	B122SB11	FTSHS6*7	10-Jul-91	4						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R5	CSO	B122	B122SB12	TSHS6*11	10-Jul-91	9						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R6	CSO	B122	B122SB13	TSHS6*13	10-Jul-91	1						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R7	CSO	B122	B122SB13	TSHS6*14	10-Jul-91	4						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R8	CSO	B216	B216TP1	Unknown	Unknown	4						Not in database; not validated				
R9	CSO	B216	B216TP1	Unknown	Unknown	7						Not in database; not validated				
R10	CSO	JANES	C-0130	FTSHS5*1	30-Apr-91	0						Rejected analytes are potential contaminants.				
R11	CSO	JANES	C-0242	FTSHS5*3	18-May-91	0						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R12	CSO	LF7	SB-LF7	TSHS5*30	13-May-91	0						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R13	CSW	LF7	LF7SEEPN	TSHW5*34	02-May-91	0						Large number of rejected analytes.				
R14	CSO	WELLS	AI10-36	TSHS5*28	17-May-91	6.5						Large number of rejected analytes.				
Comparison Samples: Results from the following samples will be compared with the original 1990-1991 results																
to determine the accuracy of the 1990-1991 analytical methods and draw conclusions about the validity of the																
entire original set of inorganics, PCBs, pesticides, and herbicides data.																
R15	CSO	LF2	LF2SB03	TSHS3*25	07-Mar-91	0	X					Pb at 15.9, confirm low.				
R16	CSO	LF2	LF2SB01	TSHS3*20	25-Jan-91	24	X					Confirm low concentrations				
R17	CSO	LF2	LF2SB01	TSHS3*19	24-Jan-91	0	X				X	Highest PAHs at LF2; risk driver for this site				
R18	CSO	LF2	LF2SB05D	TSHS3*32	10-Jan-91	25	X				X	Somewhat high PAHs				
R19	CSO	LF2	LF2SB05D	TSHS3*31	10-Jan-91	6	X				X	Somewhat high PAHs				
R20	CSO	LF2	LF2SB05D	TSHS3*33	11-Jan-91	38	X				X	Somewhat high PAHs				
R21	CSO	LF3	LF3SB04D	TSHS3*49	04-Feb-91	0	X					Coverage at LF3				
R22	CSO	LF3	LF3SB04D	TSHS3*50	04-Feb-91	34	X					Coverage at LF3				
R23	CSO	LF3	LF3SB04D	TSHS3*51	04-Feb-91	59	X					Coverage at LF3				
R24	CSO	LF3	LF3SB05	TSHS3*52	27-Jan-91	49	X					Coverage at LF3				
R25	CSO	LF3	LF3SB05	TSHS3*53	27-Jan-91	54	X					Coverage at LF3				
R26	CSO	LF3	LF3SB05	TSHS3*54	27-Jan-91	59	X					Coverage at LF3				
R27	CSO	LF4	LF3SB01	TSHS3*41	04-Feb-91	10	X					Large % UJ.				
R28	CSO	LF4	LF3SB01	TSHS3*40	04-Feb-91	2	X					Surface coverage in boring.				
R29	CSO	LF4	LF3SB01	TSHS3*42	05-Feb-91	18	X					Large % UJ.				
R30	CSO	LF4	LF3SB03	TSHS3*46	27-Jan-91	1	X				X	Comparatively high PAHs				
R31	CSO	LF5	LF5SB03	TSHS3*61	06-Feb-91	2	X					Large %J				
R32	CSO	LF5	LF5SB03	TSHS3*63	06-Feb-91	14	X					Large %J				
R33	CSO	LF5	LF5SB03	TSHS3*62	06-Feb-91	66	X					Large %J				
R34	CSO	LF6	LF6SB03	TSHS3*73	06-Feb-91	1	X					Depth variety, thallium present				
R35	CSO	LF6	LF6SB03	TSHS3*74	07-Feb-91	29	X					Depth variety, thallium present				
R36	CSO	LF6	LF6SB03	TSHS3*75	07-Feb-91	54	X					Depth variety, thallium present				
R37	CSO	LF7	LF7SB03	TSHS3*86	10-Mar-91	19	X					Thallium present, otherwise low metals.				
R38	CSO	LF7	LF7SB03	TSHS3*87	10-Mar-91	29	X					Thallium present, otherwise low metals.				
R39	CSO	LF7	LF7SB03	TSHS3*85	10-Mar-91	0	X					Thallium present, otherwise low metals.				
R40	CSO	CSA1	CSA1TP1	FTSHS4*2	07-Feb-91	3.8	X					Highest thallium onsite				
R41	CSO	CSA1	CSA1TP1	FTSHS4*1	07-Feb-91	2.1	X					Highest thallium onsite				
R42	CSO	CSA3	CSA3TP1	FTSHS4*9	08-Feb-91	2	X				X	Thallium and PAHs present for confirmation.				
R43	CSO	CSA4	CSA4TP2	TSHS4*18	04-Feb-91	7.3	X				X	High PAHs				
R44	CSO	CSA4	CSA4TP2	TSHS4*17	04-Feb-91	0.8	X				X	High PAHs				
R45	CSO	CSA4	CSA4TP1	TSHS4*16	05-Feb-91	7.5	X				X	Thallium and PAHs present for confirmation.				
R46	CSO	CSA4	CSA4TP1	TSHS4*15	05-Feb-91	1.5	X				X	Thallium and PAHs present for confirmation.				
R47	CSO	VES2	VES2TP2	TSHS4*28	22-Feb-91	7		X				Only soil detects of PCBs (in GC/MS)				
R48	CSO	VES2	VES2TP2	TSHS4*27	22-Feb-91	2.5		X				Only soil detects of PCBs (in GC/MS)				
R49	CSO	B122	B122SB01	TSHS1*37	28-Jan-91	0	X	X	X			Confirm one of the few pesticide detections				
R50	CSO	B122	B122SB08	TSHS1*63	29-Jan-91	3	X	X	X		X	High PAHs				
R51	CSO	B122	B122SB12	TSHS6*10	10-Jul-91	4	X	X	X			Confirm nondetect of pesticides.				
R52	CSO	B122	B122SB13	TSHS6*15	10-Jul-91	9	X	X	X			Confirm nondetect of pesticides.				
R53	CSO	B126	B126SB01	TSHS1*39	13-Dec-90	0	X	X	X	X		Confirm one of the few pesticide detections				
R54	CSO	B126	B126SB01	TSHS1*40	13-Dec-90	8	X	X	X	X		Confirm nondetect of pesticides.				
R55	CSO	B126	B126SB01	TSHS1*41	13-Dec-90	24	X	X	X	X		Confirm nondetect of pesticides.				
R56	CSO	B126	B126TP1	TSHS4*65	19-Mar-91	2.5	X	X	X	X		Pb at 12.4, confirm low.				
R57	CSO	NIKEMFP	MFPSB01	TSHS1*54	25-Jan-91	1	X					Thallium present				
R58	CSO	NIKEMFP	MFPSB01	TSHS1*55	25-Jan-91	14	X					Thallium present				
R59	CSO	NIKEMFP	MFPSB01	TSHS1*56	26-Jan-91	34	X					Thallium present				

Table 5: Thallium Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
B377SB01	21-Jan-91	1	JS11	TL		81.1	UGG
B377SB01	21-Jan-91	10	JS11	TL		81.8	UGG
B377SB01	21-Jan-91	24	JS11	TL		88.1	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	JS11	TL		254	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	3.8	JS11	TL		102	UGG
CSA1TP2	7-Feb-91	1.6	JS11	TL		126	UGG
CSA1TP2	7-Feb-91	7	JS11	TL		107	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	JS11	TL		113	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	2.7	JS11	TL		130	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	7	JS11	TL		120	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	1.5	JS11	TL		87.9	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	7.5	JS11	TL		115	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	JS11	TL		112	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	7.3	JS11	TL		118	UGG
LF1SB03S	1-Dec-90	4	JS11	TL		120	UGG
LF3SB01	4-Feb-91	10	JS11	TL		113	UGG
LF3SB01	4-Feb-91	2	JS11	TL		131	UGG
LF3SB01	5-Feb-91	18	JS11	TL		113	UGG
LF3SB04D	4-Feb-91	34	JS11	TL		110	UGG
LF3SB04D	4-Feb-91	59	JS11	TL		106	UGG
LF5SB03	6-Feb-91	2	JS11	TL		111	UGG
LF5SB03	6-Feb-91	66	JS11	TL		121	UGG
LF5SB03	6-Feb-91	14	JS11	TL		114	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	6	JS11	TL		123	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	10	JS11	TL		122	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	24	JS11	TL		122	UGG
LF6SB03	6-Feb-91	1	JS11	TL		137	UGG
LF6SB03	7-Feb-91	54	JS11	TL		111	UGG
LF6SB03	7-Feb-91	29	JS11	TL		107	UGG
LF7SB03	10-Mar-91	19	JS11	TL		65.3	UGG
LF7SB03	10-Mar-91	29	JS11	TL		63.2	UGG
MFPSB01	25-Jan-91	14	JS11	TL		73	UGG
MFPSB01	25-Jan-91	1	JS11	TL		105	UGG
MFPSB01	26-Jan-91	34	JS11	TL		80.8	UGG
MH-0039	19-May-91	0.2	JS11	TL		71.4	UGG
MH-5810	17-May-91	0.3	JS11	TL		201	UGG

Table 6: Pesticide/Herbicide Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
B122SB01	28-Jan-91	0	LH10	PPDDT		0.22	UGG
B122SB12	10-Jul-91	9	LH10	HPCL		0.00773	UGG
B126SB01	13-Dec-90	0	LH10	PPDDT		0.069	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LH10	CLDAN		5.2	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LH10	PPDDT		5.9	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LH10	PPDDE		0.48	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LH10	PPDDD		6.6	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LH10	MEXCLR		0.106	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LH10	LIN		0.071	UGG
C-0242	18-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDT		3.9	UGG
C-0242	18-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDE		0.21	UGG
C-0242	18-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDD		3.9	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDT		0.44	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDE		0.09	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDD		0.4	UGG
MH-3870	16-May-91	5.2	LH10	PPDDT		0.15	UGG
MH-3870	16-May-91	5.2	LH10	PPDDE		0.041	UGG
MH-3870	16-May-91	5.2	LH10	PPDDD		0.085	UGG
MH-4100	15-May-91	-5.2	LH10	PPDDT		0.07	UGG
MH-4100	15-May-91	-5.2	LH10	PPDDD		0.1	UGG
OD-1	1-May-91	0	LH10	CLDAN		0.118	UGG
OD-1	1-May-91	0	LH10	LIN		0.0199	UGG
OD-1	1-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDD		0.43	UGG
OD-1	1-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDE		0.035	UGG
OD-1	1-May-91	0	LH10	PPDDT		0.098	UGG

Table 7: PCB Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
VES2TP2	22-Feb-91	2.5	LM18	PCB260		8.9	UGG
VES2TP2	22-Feb-91	7	LM18	PCB260		11	UGG

Table 8: PAH Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
AI10-36	17-May-91	6.5	LM18	PYR		4	UGG
AI10-36	17-May-91	6.5	LM18	PHANTR		4	UGG
AI10-36	17-May-91	6.5	LM18	FANT		5	UGG
B115SB01	15-Nov-90	14	LM18	PHANTR		0.06	UGG
B115SB01	15-Nov-90	14	LM18	2MNAP		0.14	UGG
B115SB02	16-Nov-90	24	LM18	PHANTR		0.06	UGG
B115SB03	26-Nov-90	2	LM18	FANT		0.3	UGG
B115SB03	26-Nov-90	2	LM18	PYR		0.3	UGG
B115SB03	26-Nov-90	12	LM18	PHANTR		0.048	UGG
B115SB03	26-Nov-90	2	LM18	PHANTR		0.1	UGG
B115SB03	26-Nov-90	2	LM18	CHRY		0.24	UGG
B122SB01	28-Jan-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.9	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	1MNAP		0.59	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	2MNAP		1.2	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	ANTRC		0.23	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	ANAPNE		0.071	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	FLRENE		0.081	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	FANT		1.4	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	CHRY		1	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	BKFANT		0.43	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	BGHIPY		0.39	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	PYR		1.2	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	PHANTR		1.1	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	NAP		0.55	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	ICDPYR		0.37	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	BBFANT		0.63	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	BAPYR		0.58	UGG
B122SB04	29-Jan-91	1	LM18	BAANTR		0.57	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	2MNAP		0.35	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	ANTRC		0.15	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	FLRENE		0.046	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	FANT		0.86	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	CHRY		0.75	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	BKFANT		0.31	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	PYR		1.4	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	PHANTR		0.69	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	BBFANT		0.32	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	BAPYR		0.5	UGG
B122SB05	29-Jan-91	2	LM18	BAANTR		0.38	UGG
B122SB07	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	FANT		0.24	UGG
B122SB07	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	CHRY		0.21	UGG
B122SB07	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	BKFANT		0.093	UGG
B122SB07	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	PYR		0.24	UGG
B122SB07	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	PHANTR		0.11	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	2MNAP		0.5	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	BBFANT		20	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	BAPYR		10	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	BAANTR		10	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	PYR		20	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	PHANTR		10	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	NAP		0.4	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	ICDPYR		6	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	FLRENE		1	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	FANT		30	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	CHRY		20	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	BKFANT		6	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	BGHIPY		6	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	ANTRC		3	UGG
B122SB08	29-Jan-91	3	LM18	ANAPNE		0.7	UGG
B125SB01	8-Nov-90	0	LM18	CHRY		3	UGG

Table 8: PAH Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
B125SB01	8-Nov-90	0	LM18	BAANTR		2	UGG
B125SB01	8-Nov-90	0	LM18	PYR		3	UGG
B125SB01	8-Nov-90	0	LM18	PHANTR		3	UGG
B125SB01	9-Nov-90	14	LM18	ME3NAP		0.23	UGG
B125SB03	14-Nov-90	3	LM18	2MNAP		1.6	UGG
B125SB03	14-Nov-90	3	LM18	NAP		0.26	UGG
B125SB04	27-Jul-91	2	LM18	ANTRC		0.3	UGG
B125SB04	27-Jul-91	2	LM18	CHRY		1	UGG
B125SB04	27-Jul-91	2	LM18	FANT		1	UGG
B125SB04	27-Jul-91	2	LM18	PHANTR		1	UGG
B125SB04	27-Jul-91	2	LM18	PYR		1	UGG
B137TP2	25-Mar-91	3	LM18	PHANTR		0.063	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	1MNAP		2.4	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	2MNAP		4.1	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	ANAPNE		0.34	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	ANAPYL		0.08	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	2.5	LM18	ANTRC		0.082	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	ANTRC		0.73	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	2.5	LM18	BAANTR		0.28	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	BAANTR		0.81	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	BAPYR		0.59	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	2.5	LM18	BBFANT		0.47	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	BBFANT		0.78	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	BGHIPY		0.37	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	2.5	LM18	BKFANT		0.17	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	BKFANT		0.21	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	2.5	LM18	CHRY		0.44	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	CHRY		0.89	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	2.5	LM18	FANT		0.69	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	FANT		1.3	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	FLRENE		0.34	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	ICDPYR		0.43	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	NAP		2.2	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	PHANTR		3	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	2.5	LM18	PYR		0.73	UGG
B137TP4	21-Mar-91	4.3	LM18	PYR		1.1	UGG
B208SB01	27-Nov-90	2	LM18	2MNAP		0.62	UGG
B208SB01	27-Nov-90	2	LM18	NAP		0.58	UGG
B208SB01	28-Nov-90	6	LM18	NAP		0.069	UGG
B208SB02	28-Nov-90	4	LM18	FANT		0.12	UGG
B208SB02	28-Nov-90	4	LM18	PHANTR		0.052	UGG
B208SB02	28-Nov-90	4	LM18	PYR		0.09	UGG
B208SB03	30-Nov-90	4	LM18	2MNAP		3	UGG
B208SB03	30-Nov-90	4	LM18	NAP		3	UGG
B208SB04	11-Dec-90	4	LM18	2MNAP		1	UGG
B208SB04	11-Dec-90	4	LM18	NAP		3	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	2MNAP		0.082	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.71	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.57	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.33	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	BBFANT		0.44	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.7	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	16	LM18	PHANTR		0.044	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.34	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	NAP		0.061	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	BAPYR		0.35	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	BAANTR		0.3	UGG
B368SB01	8-Jan-91	0	LM18	ANTRC		0.079	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	2MNAP		0.24	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	ANTRC		0.17	UGG

Table 8: PAH Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	BAANTR		0.6	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	BAPYR		0.68	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	BBFANT		0.73	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	BGHIPY		0.4	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	CHRY		1.1	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	FANT		1.7	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	NAP		0.11	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.82	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	12	LM18	PHANTR		0.039	UGG
B368SB02	10-Jan-91	0	LM18	PYR		1.4	UGG
B368SB03	12-Jan-91	14	LM18	PHANTR		0.057	UGG
B368SB06	12-Jul-91	4	LM18	FLRENE		0.082	UGG
B368TP1	9-Mar-91	2.6	LM18	BKFANT		0.1	UGG
B368TP1	9-Mar-91	2.6	LM18	CHRY		0.2	UGG
B368TP1	9-Mar-91	2.6	LM18	FANT		0.25	UGG
B368TP1	9-Mar-91	2.6	LM18	PHANTR		0.13	UGG
B368TP1	9-Mar-91	2.6	LM18	PYR		0.27	UGG
B377SB01	21-Jan-91	10	LM18	2MNAP		0.1	UGG
B377SB01	21-Jan-91	10	LM18	PHANTR		0.071	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	4.5	LM18	2MNAP		0.096	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	3	LM18	BKFANT		0.16	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	3	LM18	CHRY		0.24	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	3	LM18	FANT		0.43	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	4.5	LM18	FANT		0.15	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	3	LM18	PHANTR		0.19	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	4.5	LM18	PHANTR		0.2	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	3	LM18	PYR		0.46	UGG
B902TP3	11-Mar-91	4.5	LM18	PYR		0.15	UGG
C-0031	30-Apr-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.046	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.53	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.25	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LM18	NAP		0.15	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.44	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.33	UGG
C-0130	30-Apr-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.17	UGG
C-0242	18-May-91	0	LM18	2MNAP		8	UGG
C-0692	15-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.053	UGG
C-0732	2-May-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.088	UGG
C-0732	2-May-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.34	UGG
C-0732	2-May-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.25	UGG
C-0732	2-May-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.41	UGG
C-0732	2-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.15	UGG
C-0732	2-May-91	0	LM18	2MNAP		0.13	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	FLRENE		0.6	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	FANT		10	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	CHRY		5	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		3	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	PYR		9	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		9	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	NAP		0.7	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	BAANTR		2	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	ANTRC		1	UGG
C-3290	15-May-91	0	LM18	ANAPNE		0.6	UGG
C-4810	2-May-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.068	UGG
C-4810	2-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.051	UGG
C-5030	2-May-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.84	UGG
C-5030	2-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.43	UGG
C-5030	2-May-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.61	UGG
C-5030	2-May-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.39	UGG
C-5030	2-May-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.24	UGG

Table 8: PAH Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
C-5030	2-May-91	0	LM18	BBFANT		0.36	UGG
C-5030	2-May-91	0	LM18	BAANTR		0.24	UGG
C-5030	2-May-91	0	LM18	ANTRC		0.11	UGG
C-5360	2-May-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.22	UGG
C-5360	2-May-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.19	UGG
C-5360	2-May-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.11	UGG
C-5360	2-May-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.35	UGG
C-5360	2-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.2	UGG
C-5360	2-May-91	0	LM18	2MNAP		0.092	UGG
CSA1SB01	12-Dec-90	2	LM18	2MNAP		6	UGG
CSA1SB01	12-Dec-90	2	LM18	PYR		1	UGG
CSA1SB01	12-Dec-90	2	LM18	ANTRC		0.8	UGG
CSA1SB01	12-Dec-90	2	LM18	ANAPNE		0.7	UGG
CSA1SB01	12-Dec-90	2	LM18	PHANTR		5	UGG
CSA1SB01	12-Dec-90	2	LM18	NAP		1	UGG
CSA1SB01	12-Dec-90	2	LM18	FLRENE		1	UGG
CSA1SB01	12-Dec-90	2	LM18	FANT		1	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	LM18	2MNAP		0.2	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	LM18	ANTRC		0.067	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	LM18	BKFANT		0.15	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	LM18	CHRY		0.22	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	LM18	FANT		0.31	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	LM18	NAP		0.12	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	LM18	PHANTR		0.45	UGG
CSA1TP1	7-Feb-91	2.1	LM18	PYR		0.23	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	2MNAP		0.23	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	ANAPNE		0.38	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	ANAPYL		0.11	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	ANTRC		1.6	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	BAANTR		4	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	BAPYR		4.2	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	BBFANT		4.3	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	BKFANT		2	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	CHRY		5.7	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	FANT		10	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	FLRENE		0.65	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	ICDPYR		2.5	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	NAP		0.13	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	PHANTR		4.7	UGG
CSA3TP1	8-Feb-91	2	LM18	PYR		7	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	7	LM18	ANTRC		0.1	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	7	LM18	BAANTR		0.22	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	7	LM18	BKFANT		0.16	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	7	LM18	CHRY		0.36	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	7	LM18	FANT		0.63	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	2.7	LM18	PHANTR		0.06	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	7	LM18	PHANTR		0.3	UGG
CSA3TP2	8-Feb-91	7	LM18	PYR		0.52	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	1.5	LM18	BAANTR		0.24	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	1.5	LM18	BAPYR		0.38	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	1.5	LM18	BKFANT		0.31	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	1.5	LM18	CHRY		0.57	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	1.5	LM18	FANT		0.6	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	1.5	LM18	PHANTR		0.24	UGG
CSA4TP1	5-Feb-91	1.5	LM18	PYR		0.75	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	2MNAP		1	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	2PNAP		4	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	ANAPNE		6	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	ANTRC		10	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	BAANTR		20	UGG

Table 8: PAH Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	BAPYR		30	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	BBFANT		30	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	BGHIPY		10	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	BKFANT		10	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	CHRY		30	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	7.3	LM18	FANT		0.16	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	FANT		70	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	FLRENE		6	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	ICDPYR		10	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	NAP		1	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	7.3	LM18	PHANTR		0.21	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	PHANTR		50	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	7.3	LM18	PYR		0.27	UGG
CSA4TP2	4-Feb-91	0.8	LM18	PYR		60	UGG
LF1SB01	14-Jan-91	39	LM18	2MNAP		0.14	UGG
LF1SB01	14-Jan-91	9	LM18	PHANTR		0.067	UGG
LF1SB01	14-Jan-91	39	LM18	PHANTR		0.07	UGG
LF1SB02	21-Jan-91	14	LM18	2MNAP		0.11	UGG
LF1SB02	21-Jan-91	29	LM18	2MNAP		0.22	UGG
LF1SB02	21-Jan-91	14	LM18	PHANTR		0.058	UGG
LF1SB02	21-Jan-91	29	LM18	PHANTR		0.077	UGG
LF1SB03D	9-Jan-91	51	LM18	PHANTR		0.062	UGG
LF1SB03S	1-Dec-90	14	LM18	BKFANT		1	UGG
LF1SB03S	1-Dec-90	14	LM18	CHRY		2	UGG
LF1SB03S	1-Dec-90	14	LM18	FANT		3	UGG
LF1SB03S	1-Dec-90	14	LM18	PHANTR		1	UGG
LF1SB03S	1-Dec-90	14	LM18	PYR		2	UGG
LF1SB04	11-Jan-91	14	LM18	2MNAP		0.16	UGG
LF1SB04	11-Jan-91	24	LM18	2MNAP		0.12	UGG
LF1SB04	11-Jan-91	14	LM18	PHANTR		0.065	UGG
LF1SB04	11-Jan-91	24	LM18	PHANTR		0.054	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	14	LM18	2MNAP		0.1	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	24	LM18	2MNAP		0.13	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.18	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.37	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.54	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.2	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	14	LM18	PHANTR		0.052	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	24	LM18	PHANTR		0.064	UGG
LF1SB05	12-Jan-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.52	UGG
LF2SB01	24-Jan-91	0	LM18	PYR		10	UGG
LF2SB01	24-Jan-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		9	UGG
LF2SB01	25-Jan-91	24	LM18	PHANTR		0.066	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	ANTRC		0.12	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	BAANTR		0.37	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	BAPYR		0.43	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	BBFANT		0.54	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.32	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.69	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.99	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	FLRENE		0.063	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.51	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	10	LM18	PHANTR		0.042	UGG
LF2SB02	13-Jan-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.9	UGG
LF2SB04D	8-Jan-91	6	LM18	PHANTR		0.045	UGG
LF2SB04D	8-Jan-91	29	LM18	PHANTR		0.052	UGG
LF2SB05D	10-Jan-91	6	LM18	CHRY		0.33	UGG
LF2SB05D	10-Jan-91	6	LM18	PHANTR		0.11	UGG
LF2SB05D	10-Jan-91	6	LM18	FANT		0.21	UGG
LF2SB05D	10-Jan-91	6	LM18	PYR		0.29	UGG

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
LF2SB05D	10-Jan-91	6	LM18	BKFANT		0.17	UGG
LF2SB05D	11-Jan-91	38	LM18	PHANTR		0.082	UGG
LF2SB05D	11-Jan-91	38	LM18	2MNAP		0.1	UGG
LF2SB06D	13-Jan-91	10	LM18	2MNAP		0.092	UGG
LF2SB06D	13-Jan-91	10	LM18	PHANTR		0.13	UGG
LF2SB07D	14-Jan-91	18	LM18	PHANTR		0.041	UGG
LF2SB07D	14-Jan-91	6	LM18	PHANTR		0.047	UGG
LF2SB07D	15-Jan-91	32	LM18	PHANTR		0.095	UGG
LF2SB07D	15-Jan-91	32	LM18	2MNAP		0.12	UGG
LF2SB08	23-Jul-91	2	LM18	FANT		0.11	UGG
LF2SB08	23-Jul-91	2	LM18	PHANTR		0.042	UGG
LF2SB08	23-Jul-91	2	LM18	PYR		0.097	UGG
LF2SB09	24-Jul-91	28	LM18	2MNAP		0.086	UGG
LF2SB09	24-Jul-91	28	LM18	PHANTR		0.061	UGG
LF3SB02	11-Feb-91	34	LM18	PHANTR		0.048	UGG
LF3SB03	27-Jan-91	1	LM18	FLRENE		0.5	UGG
LF3SB03	27-Jan-91	1	LM18	FANT		3	UGG
LF3SB03	27-Jan-91	1	LM18	CHRY		2	UGG
LF3SB03	27-Jan-91	1	LM18	BKFANT		1	UGG
LF3SB03	27-Jan-91	1	LM18	PYR		3	UGG
LF3SB03	27-Jan-91	1	LM18	PHANTR		4	UGG
LF3SB03	27-Jan-91	1	LM18	ANTRC		0.9	UGG
LF3SB03	28-Jan-91	30	LM18	2MNAP		0.077	UGG
LF3SB03	28-Jan-91	30	LM18	PHANTR		0.055	UGG
LF3SB04D	4-Feb-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.055	UGG
LF3SB04D	4-Feb-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.098	UGG
LF5SB03	6-Feb-91	2	LM18	FANT		0.092	UGG
LF5SB03	6-Feb-91	2	LM18	PHANTR		0.081	UGG
LF5SB03	6-Feb-91	2	LM18	PYR		0.13	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	6	LM18	2MNAP		0.1	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	10	LM18	2MNAP		0.073	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	6	LM18	ANTRC		0.11	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	6	LM18	FANT		0.24	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	6	LM18	FLRENE		0.068	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	6	LM18	NAP		0.13	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	6	LM18	PHANTR		0.25	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	10	LM18	PHANTR		0.047	UGG
LF5SB04D	7-Feb-91	6	LM18	PYR		0.19	UGG
LF7LCS	16-May-91	17.1	LM18	PYR		0.36	UGG
LF7LCS	16-May-91	17.1	LM18	PHANTR		0.2	UGG
LF7LCS	16-May-91	17.1	LM18	FANT		0.42	UGG
LF7SB04D	23-Jan-91	0	LM18	ANTRC		0.063	UGG
LF7SB04D	23-Jan-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.1	UGG
LF7SB04D	23-Jan-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.18	UGG
LF7SB04D	23-Jan-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.26	UGG
LF7SB04D	23-Jan-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.22	UGG
LF7SB04D	23-Jan-91	4	LM18	PHANTR		0.054	UGG
LF7SB04D	23-Jan-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.27	UGG
LF7SB06D	25-Jul-91	18	LM18	PHANTR		0.048	UGG
LF7SB06D	25-Jul-91	30	LM18	PHANTR		0.072	UGG
LF7SEEPNW	2-May-91	0	LM18	ANTRC		0.11	UGG
LF7SEEPNW	2-May-91	0	LM18	BBFANT		0.52	UGG
LF7SEEPNW	2-May-91	0	LM18	PYR		0.79	UGG
LF7SEEPNW	2-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.5	UGG
LF7SEEPNW	2-May-91	0	LM18	FANT		0.76	UGG
LF7SEEPNW	2-May-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.49	UGG
LF7SEEPNW	2-May-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.25	UGG
LF7SEEPNW	2-May-91	0	LM18	BAANTR		0.33	UGG
MFPSB01	25-Jan-91	14	LM18	PHANTR		0.04	UGG
OD-1	1-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		0.052	UGG

Table 8: PAH Detections in Soil

Site ID	Sample Date	Depth (ft)	Method	Test Name	Boolean	Value	Units
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	2MNAP		0.096	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	ANAPNE		0.18	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	ANTRC		0.31	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	BAANTR		0.47	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	BAPYR		0.49	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	BBFANT		0.72	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	BKFANT		0.38	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	CHRY		0.62	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	FANT		1.1	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	FLRENE		0.3	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		1.2	UGG
OD-2	1-May-91	0	LM18	PYR		1.6	UGG
SB-LF7	13-May-91	0	LM18	PHANTR		3	UGG
SB-LF7	13-May-91	0	LM18	PYR		3	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	3	LM18	ANAPNE		0.22	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	3	LM18	ANTRC		7.1	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	8	LM18	ANTRC		0.83	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	3	LM18	CHRY		0.69	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	3	LM18	FANT		0.84	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	3	LM18	FLRENE		0.61	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	3	LM18	NAP		0.1	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	3	LM18	PHANTR		1.8	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	8	LM18	PHANTR		0.086	UGG
VES6TP1	5-Mar-91	3	LM18	PYR		0.62	UGG
VES6TP3	12-Feb-91	2	LM18	BKFANT		0.15	UGG
VES6TP3	12-Feb-91	2	LM18	CHRY		0.22	UGG
VES6TP3	12-Feb-91	2	LM18	FANT		0.3	UGG
VES6TP3	12-Feb-91	2	LM18	PHANTR		0.12	UGG
VES6TP3	12-Feb-91	2	LM18	PYR		0.27	UGG
VES9TP3	7-Mar-91	3	LM18	1MNAP		1.3	UGG
VES9TP3	7-Mar-91	1.7	LM18	2MNAP		0.16	UGG
VES9TP3	7-Mar-91	3	LM18	2MNAP		1.5	UGG
VES9TP3	7-Mar-91	3	LM18	FLRENE		0.081	UGG
VES9TP3	7-Mar-91	1.7	LM18	NAP		0.14	UGG
VES9TP3	7-Mar-91	3	LM18	NAP		0.46	UGG
VES9TP3	7-Mar-91	3	LM18	PHANTR		0.17	UGG

Table 9: Site Risk Summary										
Fort Sheridan Data Usability and Resampling Proposal										
	Percentage of J Qualified Analytes									
	In Each Sample-Maximum, Minimum									
	and Average for Each RI Site			Current		Future		Risk		
Site	Max % Qual	Min % Qual	Ave % Qual	Risk	HQ	Risk	HQ	Drivers		
Landfill 1	40.70%	11.80%	25.96%	5.30E-09	5.40E-05	2.10E-06	0.83	NL		
Landfill 2	40.00%	10.59%	19.65%	1.20E-07	1.30E-04	1.20E-05	0.0031	PAHs		
Landfill 3	56.50%	11.32%	29.58%	7.30E-07	1.00E+00	1.00E-05	9	DDT/RDX, thallium		
Landfill 4	(incl in LF 3)									
Landfill 5	56.25%	14.20%	35.18%	None	1.20E-02	None	1.8	Thallium		
Landfill 6	30.00%	15.63%	22.37%	8.00E-07	1.00E+00	1.10E-05	9.4	Thallium/RDX/DDT		
Landfill 7	58.73%	9.47%	19.85%	3.80E-05	3.40E-01	6.70E-05	4.7	Tl, Cr,VC		
Coal Storage Area 1	35.25%	15.83%	24.11%	None	1.10E-01	1.90E-06	2.5	Tl		
Coal Storage Area 2	16.39%	14.88%	15.49%			1.00E-05	2.7	Zn, DDT, RDX		
Coal Storage Area 3	36.62%	25.41%	30.24%	1.30E-06	1.30E-02	3.00E-04	9.1	PAHs,Tl, Zn		
Coal Storage Area 4	69.47%	17.29%	52.09%	9.50E-06	1.70E-02	2.00E-03	8.6	PAHs,Tl, Zn		
Underground Storage Tank at Bldg 115	(No longer in RI)									
Underground Storage Tank at Bldg 125	(No longer in RI)									
Underground Storage Tank at Bldg 208	(No longer in RI)									
Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 1	13.48%	2.21%	7.58%			1.00E-05	2.7	Zn,DDT,RDX		
Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 2	2.21%	2.21%	4.15%			1.00E-05	2.7	Zn,DDT,RDX		
Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 5	23.03%	2.22%	8.61%		3.10E-08	1.90E-06	0.83	SO4,Cl		
Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 6	21.43%	2.22%	9.85%	2.90E-08	8.20E-05	2.10E-06	0.83	SO4,Cl		
Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 7	13.99%	2.22%	5.13%	6.80E-07	3.40E-01	1.00E-05	2.7	Zn,DDT,RDX		
Vehicle and Equipment Storage Area 9	25.45%	2.22%	9.53%	None	5.40E-06	None	0.00045	NL		
Bldgs 137X, 137,and 139 Storage Area	21.23%	11.32%	14.53%	1.30E-06	3.10E-02	3.20E-06	0.84	NL		
Building 122 Storage Area	46.77%	20.32%	29.48%	1.40E-06	1.40E-02	9.50E-06	0.87	PAHs		
Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 126	79.25%	54.17%	68.43%	1.10E-06	2.80E-02	2.10E-06	0.14	NL		
Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 128	9.15%	5.19%	7.53%			1.90E-06	0.83	NL		
Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 216	(No data in IRDMIS)					6.60E-05	4.4	Cr		
Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 368	23.08%	1.47%	13.00%	2.90E-06	5.70E-02	6.90E-05	3.7	Cr, PAHs		
Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 377	44.44%	26.85%	33.88%	1.20E-06	9.00E-02	3.30E-05	6.1	Cr		
Miscellaneous Yard Area at Bldg 902	18.83%	1.48%	7.98%		1.00E-08	1.90E-06	0.83	NL		
Building 43	45.41%	39.87%	42.64%					NL		
Building 70	(building interiors; no longer in RI but now in EBS)									
Building 122	(building interiors; no longer in RI but now in EBS)									
Building 137	(building interiors; no longer in RI but now in EBS)									
Building 139	(building interiors; no longer in RI but now in EBS)									
Building 142	(building interiors; no longer in RI but now in EBS)									
Building 361	(building interiors; no longer in RI but now in EBS)									
Missile Fueling Point	38.71%	17.34%	26.61%		1.30E-02	1.90E-06	2.2	Tl,RDX		
NIKE Missile Silos	81.48%	5.34%	20.50%					NL		
Janes Ravine	38.27%	20.92%	27.29%	3.90E-06	5.40E-01	2.10E-05	1.6	DDD,DDT		
Airport Drain	31.32%	15.73%	23.52%	Lead	3.10E-02	Lead	0.018	NL		
Hutchinson Ravine	30.11%	7.65%	14.43%	6.70E-08	5.10E-02	3.60E-07	0.057	NL		
Scott Loop Drain	24.44%	12.50%	18.47%	3.80E-06	3.20E-02	2.10E-05	0.034	PAHs		
Bartlett Ravine	25.42%	17.68%	21.24%	1.40E-04	6.60E+00	7.80E-04	7.5	B2EHPH,MeCl,lead		
Officer Family Housing Drain	24.31%	10.78%	17.54%	Lead	2.80E-02	Lead	0.028	NL		
Van Horne Ravine	14.94%	8.70%	10.85%	5.20E-07	5.30E-02	2.80E-06	0.054	NL		
Wells Ravine	16.17%	9.43%	12.49%					NL		
Shenck Ravine	22.54%	10.56%	16.55%	Lead	2.50E-02	Lead	0.025	NL		
Legend:										
B2EHPH	Bis-2-ethylhexyl phthalate									
Cl	Chloride									
Cr	Chromium									
DDD	DDD									
DDT	DDT									
Lead	Lead									
LEAD	Lead was only carcinogen found; UBK used instead of risk calculations									
MeCl	Methylene Chloride									
NL	Not listed in the RI									
PAHs	PAHs									
RDX	RDX									
SO4	Sulfate									
Tl	Thallium									
VC	Vinyl Chloride									
Zn	Zinc									